

MAY 2015

---

# How and Why Women Give

CURRENT AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH  
ON WOMEN'S PHILANTHROPY



**IUPUI WOMEN'S PHILANTHROPY INSTITUTE**  
LILLY FAMILY SCHOOL OF PHILANTHROPY

### **The Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy**

Every culture depends on philanthropy and nonprofit organizations to provide essential elements of a civil society. Effective philanthropy and nonprofit management are instrumental in creating and maintaining public confidence in the philanthropic traditions – voluntary association, voluntary giving, and voluntary action. The Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy increases the understanding of philanthropy and improves its practice through programs in research, teaching, public service, and public affairs. Learn more at <https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/>.

 @IUPhilanthropy

### **The Women's Philanthropy Institute (WPI)**

WPI is part of the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. WPI increases understanding of women's philanthropy through rigorous research and education, interpreting and sharing these insights broadly to improve philanthropy. Learn more at <https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/institutes/womens-philanthropy-institute>.

 @WPlinsights

### **The Lilly Family School of Philanthropy Project Team**

Debra Mesch, Ph.D., Professor and Director, Women's Philanthropy Institute and Eileen Lamb O'Gara Chair in Women's Philanthropy

Una Osili, Ph.D., Director of Research and Professor of Economics and Philanthropic Studies

Andrea Pactor, M.A., Associate Director, Women's Philanthropy Institute

Jacqueline Ackerman, M.P.A., Project Coordinator

Elizabeth Dale, Research Assistant

Jon Bergdoll, Applied Statistician

Adriene Davis Kalugyer, Manager of Public Affairs

Julie Scholl, Manager of Constituent Relations

Andy Ware, Digital Marketing Strategist

Cynthia Hyatte, Administrative Assistant

This research was completed with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect official positions or policies of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

The Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

University Hall, Suite 3000

301 University Blvd.

Indianapolis, IN 46202

317-274-4200

[www.philanthropy.iupui.edu](http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
I. Introduction .....	6
II. Women's Philanthropy in the United States: A Historical Perspective .....	8
III. Data and Methods in Research on Women's Philanthropy .....	11
IV. Theories on Gender Differences in Giving .....	12
A. Economic Approaches .....	13
B. Psychological Approaches .....	15
C. Social Approaches .....	17
D. Organizational Approaches .....	19
V. Gender Differences in Giving .....	21
VI. Household Decision Making and Charitable Giving .....	29
VII. Gender and Volunteering .....	33
VIII. Collaborative Philanthropy and New Forms of Giving .....	36
IX. Philanthropy for Women's and Girls' Issues .....	39
X. Conclusions and Opportunities for Future Research .....	41
References .....	45
Appendix A: Overview on Data and Methods in Philanthropic Research .....	57

## Executive Summary

Women have been active in philanthropy in the United States throughout its history, but women today have the potential to take an increased role in philanthropy. Over the past 40 years, women's roles have changed dramatically in American society as they have made significant gains in their progress toward economic and social equality with men. With increasing incomes, educational attainment, and control over wealth, women have never before had so much control over philanthropic resources. Further, in both the U.S. and around the world, there has been a growing interest in investing in the rights and well-being of women and girls.

The purpose of this literature review is to summarize the existing academic research on women, gender, and philanthropy and create a comprehensive picture of what we know about women's giving and gender differences in giving today. We draw from studies in various academic disciplines that cover more than four decades of research. This research uses a variety of methods, such as surveys, experiments, and institutional data, which can impact study results and may contribute to differences among the findings. An important limitation is that the majority of these studies are U.S.-based, and results may not be generalizable internationally. Additionally, a review such as this also raises questions, debates, and gaps in knowledge, which will help researchers identify crucial questions for future study.

## Key Findings

***Single women are more likely to give to charity and give higher amounts than similarly-situated men.*** In single-headed households, researchers consistently find that women are more likely than men to give to charity. A number of the most generalizable studies also show that, when controlling for income, wealth, education, and other important demographic variables, single women also give higher dollar amounts to charity than single men. Individual studies have found no gender differences in the amount given or that men give more, but this is most typical when looking at specific organizations or donor populations, such as a particular health organization or alumni giving to a university athletic program.

***Single women are more likely than single men to give to nearly every charitable subsector.*** In addition to giving as a whole, single women are more likely than men to give and give higher amounts to almost every charitable subsector. One exception to this finding is studies that include giving to sports and recreation; men are more likely than women to give to this specific sector, which is not categorized consistently across studies. Another exception is among high net worth donors, who demonstrate fewer differences in their giving based on gender.

***Women tend to spread their giving across more organizations, while men tend to concentrate their giving.*** Single women also tend to be more egalitarian in their giving, in that they spread their giving across more organizations than men, supporting a higher number of causes. Single men's giving tends to be focused on a slightly narrower range of charities.

***Marriage has a positive impact on giving.*** Understanding motivations and patterns of giving within a household is more complex than comparing single men and women. In general, marriage has a positive influence on giving. Married couples tend to give more than single male-

or female-headed households. Marriage has a particular influence on men's giving. When men marry, they are more likely to give to charity and give higher amounts. One explanation is that marriage seems to socialize men into becoming more charitable. Marriage also has the effect of expanding both individuals' networks and frees up financial resources.

***The majority of married couples decide on charitable giving jointly.*** The dominant charitable decision-making model for married couples is to make giving decisions jointly. Joint decisions involve bargaining—each member of the couple has their own giving preferences, but, when they give jointly, the couple has to come to an agreement over what their giving will look like. Research shows that when couples bargain, they tend to resolve a conflict about giving in favor of the husband's giving preferences. Studies are mixed as to whether bargaining reduces or increases the amount given to charity.

***Among married couples, “who decides?” matters for giving.*** In couples where either the husband or wife decide on charitable giving, research shows different giving preferences in terms of amount and recipient. Research has found that households with male deciders make larger donations than female or jointly-deciding couples, and that female deciders allocate giving differently. Often, among sole-decider households, the decision-making spouse is likely to have the higher educational attainment, whereas in jointly-deciding couples, both individuals have high educational attainment. Income also influences decision making. This research also holds several contradictory findings that suggest further study is needed.

***Women volunteer more than men.*** In general, researchers find that women (both single and married) are more likely to volunteer and volunteer more hours than men. Looking at just single women and men, single women volunteer at almost twice the rate of single men. This finding may be influenced by differences in women's and men's motivations, as well as their labor market participation.

***Women are more likely to engage in collaborative giving via a giving circle.*** New forms of giving, particularly giving circles, have been more attractive to female donors. Research shows that the vast majority of giving circle participants are women and that more than half of U.S. giving circles are women-only groups. Additionally, many giving circles also prioritize funding to issues that affect women and girls.

***Research on giving to women's and girls' issues is understudied.*** Current surveys on philanthropic giving do not categorize giving to women and girls, making tracking the growth and amount of such giving difficult. Among foundation funding, researchers estimate less than 10 percent of all funding supports organizations run by and for women and girls. A small group of women's foundations were established beginning in the 1970s and 1980s to build support for organizations run by and for women and girls and are part of a larger subset of social change foundations.

### ***Why do differences exist?***

Researchers have documented many factors that influence giving, like age, educational attainment, and differences in income, wealth, and labor force participation. But even when all these factors are included in statistical analysis, differences between men and women remain that research seeks to explain. A number of theories, in disciplines ranging from economics to sociology and psychology to organizational studies, provide fruitful explanations for giving

behavior. Below, we highlight several key theories that can help explain gender differences in motivation and giving behavior.

**Empathy.** Several studies from the field of psychology have shown that women tend to be more empathic and altruistic than men. Empathy has been shown to be positively related to charitable giving; therefore, one theory is that women give and volunteer more because they are more empathic. In addition to self-reported empathy, when women give, they tend to express a desire to help others, whereas men tend to focus on the benefits that come from being charitable. For example, one study examined the role of empathy in motivating male and female donors. It found that empathy as a motivator works well for women, but not for men. A key motivation for men was connecting the cause to their individual self-interest.

**Collaboration and Risk.** Another reason women may give differently than men is that they tend to be more cooperative and like to avoid risk. This might help explain, for example, why women tend to spread out their giving more than men—perhaps their collaborative nature makes them more likely to respond to a friend’s request, or they see a large investment in one organization as a more risky choice. Economists find that women give even when the price of giving is high; for example, if a donor receives a tax benefit for giving, it reduces the overall cost of making a gift. Research finds that men would give more when they receive a tax break, whereas women would give even if the tax break didn’t exist.

**Social Context.** Sociologists study how individuals trust and relate to others in their communities and how giving may be influenced by social norms. One reason why men’s and women’s giving looks different may be because their social networks look different and are tied in some ways to gender roles; for example, women’s social networks tend to be more religious, and men’s tend to be more secular. The relationship between gender and social norms is also interesting. Men tend to take group behavior into account when they give; they are looking to their peers to see where and how much they are giving, and they use that to inform their own giving; this is not a behavior that is characteristic of women.

### ***Implications for organizations, funders, and future research***

This report provides the first comprehensive literature review on women’s giving and philanthropic behavior that is truly interdisciplinary in nature. In reviewing the existing research, it is clear that women play a distinct and powerful role in philanthropy. Nonprofit organizations can use the findings from academic research to develop methods of identifying and cultivating female donors. These findings also shed light on the importance of understanding how married couples decide on their giving and the influence of factors such as educational attainment and income on couples’ decision making. Further, this review highlights the need for continued research in a number of areas, including giving to causes that support women and girls; the role of technology on philanthropy; and the influence of age, generation, and life course on giving. Only with sustained research will we be able to better understand the many influences on philanthropic behavior and resolve disparate findings. We invite scholars and practitioners to join us in furthering this research so we can best understand how women can and will move philanthropy forward.

## I. Introduction

Over the past 40 years, women in America have made significant gains in their progress toward economic and social equality with men. Women's educational attainment has increased, with women now earning more college and advanced degrees each year than men (Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2011). More women are entering the labor force than ever before. The gender wage gap, while still significant, has narrowed for women of all races and classes, from average earnings of 62 percent of men's wages in 1979 to 80 percent of men's wages in 2008 (BLS, 2011). Women are delaying marriage longer, earning higher incomes, and accumulating personal wealth (Caucutt, Guner, & Knowles, 2002). Women have unprecedented options to control their fertility, leading not only to greater choices over their life course, but often higher lifetime earnings as well (Goldin & Katz, 2000). And when women do marry, their economic and educational gains often yield greater bargaining power in everything from managing household work to financial decision making with their spouse (Friedberg & Webb, 2006). While challenges remain in important areas of economic and social well-being, particularly for women of color and low-income women, women's freedoms and choices have greatly expanded.

In the past few decades, there has also been a growing interest in the role that women can play in improving their local and global communities. One area that has assumed recent prominence is investing in the rights and well-being of women and girls, not just in the United States, but around the world. Numerous studies show that investing in women and girls has increased economic development, education, and health, among other effects, not only for the women themselves, but for their families and the communities around them (Chaaban & Cunningham, 2011; Summers, Khan, & Sabot, 1992). Gender equality is a centerpiece of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals, and governments and foundations have increased their commitments, if not always funding, to address gaps in economic, political, health, and educational outcomes (United Nations, 2015).

Both women's economic and social gains as well as increased funding to women's and girls' issues impact the ways women participate in philanthropy as donors and as recipients. While women have always been philanthropic actors, never before have women had so much control over philanthropic resources. In addition to rising incomes and educational levels in the United States, women are more likely to control inheritances (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; Wang & Parker, 2014). Increasingly, nonprofits are being asked to examine the gender representation on their boards, often resulting in increased recruitment and placement for women's volunteer leadership (Abzug, DiMaggio, Gray, Kang, & Useem, 1993; Ostrower, 1995). Women are also pioneering new approaches to philanthropic participation, from the establishment of women's funding networks and foundations to the growth of giving circles and person-to-person giving.

Academic research on charitable giving emerged as a multidisciplinary field in the 1980s rooted in the social sciences (Katz, 1999). However, empirical research and comprehensive literature reviews on charitable behavior are often confined to a specific discipline, which has limited the development of theory (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a). Some consistent findings have emerged in the literature on charitable giving. Religion, education, income, age, gender, and family composition are key predictors of giving (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012). Religious affiliation and church attendance are positively related to giving. The relationship of age with giving is also generally positive. Most studies find that higher levels of

education, higher income, and having a paid job correlate with higher levels of giving. Studies find donors tend to be married, have children, and have grown up with parents who role modeled philanthropic behavior. Past research on women's charitable giving has typically used gender as a control variable. Not until recently have studies, including many in this literature review, analyzed the relationship between gender and giving as a key research question.

While charitable giving has been studied around the world, the vast majority of research has been conducted in the United States, followed by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Canada. Several key studies have also dealt with European or global data, which provide important points of geographic comparison. At times these studies' findings are somewhat generalizable to the U.S. population, while others may focus on particular donor groups that do not always have U.S. counterparts.

To date, synthesis of the academic literature on women's philanthropy, in particular, has been limited, but research has documented a number of ways gender matters in philanthropic behavior. This paper provides an extensive review of existing studies on charitable giving that focus on gender, primarily from a U.S. context. Drawing from a diverse set of academic disciplines, researchers have examined the motivations, theories, and influences that may affect women's and men's giving. Economists and sociologists have investigated the absolute differences in the amount men and women give as well as where those gifts are directed. A related strand of literature examines giving from the household level, where women's philanthropic influence is shaped by being part of married couples. Emerging research is examining new forms of giving, such as giving circles and crowdfunding, which arguably democratize philanthropy and appeal disproportionately to women. After considering the existing research in each of these areas regarding women as donors, we turn to a small body of literature surrounding giving to women and girls, which has been covered in the practitioner fields but has little academic study. By identifying the multiple ways gender influences philanthropy, we offer a comprehensive review of existing research as well as new topics and questions researchers should undertake in order to better understand women's philanthropy.



## II. Women's Philanthropy in the United States: A Historical Perspective

The study of how and why women give cannot be separated from American philanthropy's historical context. Women's philanthropy, as donors and as recipients, has a long and significant history in America, and has been documented in countries around the world (McCarthy, 2001). As wives, mothers, daughters, and independent women, throughout history women have sought ways to improve society beyond the limits of their domestic roles and have been key actors for the common good. Historically, families and religious organizations provided the majority of care and charity to widows, orphans, and strangers. In the American context, as independent philanthropic and voluntary organizations emerged in greater numbers following the Revolutionary War, women claimed a space for philanthropic action, as donors, volunteers, and even founders and leaders of new organizations. In short, women's participation in philanthropy is not a new phenomenon, although their activities and influence have been shaped to a significant extent by their shifting economic position and social roles. Further, contemporary research has examined gender as a distinct unit of analysis, revealing patterns and trends that both reflect and inform the ways women participate in philanthropy today.

Women have a rich history of volunteerism and activism in the nonprofit sector, although their roles and influence continue to be obscured in broader accounts of American philanthropy (Steinberg & Jacobs, 1994; Odendahl, 1996). Women's active involvement in voluntary associations since the early days of the Republic is a largely unacknowledged facet of American history and had a profound impact on the country's social fabric (see historical timeline following). Kathleen McCarthy (1990), a prominent historian of women's philanthropy, argues that, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, women created "parallel power structures" within philanthropic and voluntary associations (parallel to the business and political organizations created by men), which allowed them to develop and maintain public identities while enmeshed in their traditional gender roles and family obligations. By working in voluntary associations, often in unpaid roles, women learned organizational and leadership skills, managed money and property, and developed personal confidence (Scott, 1984). Through philanthropic institutions, women alleviated poverty, promoted religion, increased education, fought against slavery, influenced public policy, and secured the right to vote.

Importantly, women's philanthropic activity was also shaped by the intersection of gender with religious identity, race, and class. While middle-class and affluent white Protestant women founded and led the major charitable organizations in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Jewish women organized along parallel paths, establishing schools for Jewish education and providing relief for widows and orphans (McCarthy, 2003). Free African American women, especially in the north, engaged in a broad spectrum of charitable activities, focusing on self-help, mutual aid, and education (McCarthy, 2003; Scott, 1990). Often, African American women created their own organizations when excluded by white women, as in the case of the Manhattan Abolition Society in New York City, founded in 1840, and the women's clubs of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century.

While the concept of women's parallel power structures offers recognition of women's historical role within the voluntary sector, scholars have addressed a number of factors that have simultaneously served to undermine women's philanthropic work. The notion of selfless womanhood—helping and giving of oneself to others—is often seen as women's traditional gender role and an implicit expectation of women's voluntary work (Rose, 1994). The image of

“Lady Bountiful” has served to undermine women’s philanthropic activity and trivialize their contributions (Chambré, 1993; Daniels, 1985; McCarthy, 1990). Women’s work on fundraising committees and, in particular, their work to create large-scale benefits and galas remained one of the few available roles for upper-class women to engage in philanthropic work well into the late 20<sup>th</sup> century (Daniels, 1985; Caster, 2008). In 1985, Arlene Kaplan Daniels highlighted the invisibility of women’s traditional fundraising and helping roles in her study of women volunteers. As this work was also unpaid, she termed them “invisible careers,” which focused attention on the fact that some women were able to create meaningful work, despite the limitations of unpaid, sociability work and its lack of recognition. Table 1 below contains a timeline of significant events in women’s philanthropy.

**Table 1: Timeline of Women’s Philanthropy in the United States**

1643	Lady Ann Moulson (née Radcliffe) contributed £100 for scholarships at the new Harvard University
1797	First female-controlled charity in the United States, Society for the Relief of Poor Women and Children, is established in New York
1820s & 1830s	Protestant women’s group formed “cent” societies to raise money for mission work in the United States and around the globe
1837	Mary Lyon founded Mount Holyoke College, the oldest school that was established from inception as an institution of higher education for women that is still an all-women’s college
1840	African American women founded the Manhattan Abolition Society in New York City when excluded by white women from the many anti-slavery societies that had formed
1863-1865	Women organized Sanitary Fairs to support soldiers during the Civil War, raising more than half of the funds collected by the United States Sanitary Commission, a private relief agency
1881	Clara Barton founded the American Red Cross based on her experiences as a nurse during the Civil War and the Swiss-inspired global Red Cross network
1889	Jane Addams founded Hull House in Chicago, the first “settlement” house to provide social and educational opportunities for working class people, a movement that grew to almost 500 settlement houses nationally by 1920
1890	Jane Cunningham Croly established the General Federation of Women’s Clubs to unite the many clubs operating independently around the country; with 100,000 members today, the organization continues its mission to improve the community through volunteer service
1890	Two women’s suffrage organizations merged to form the National American Woman Suffrage Association, representing women at the local and state level
1907	Margaret Olivia Slocum Sage established the Russell Sage Foundation with a \$10 million gift
1920	19 <sup>th</sup> Amendment ratified, giving women the right to vote after a 72-year struggle
1929	Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, Lillie Bliss, and Mary Quinn Sullivan established Museum of Modern Art in New York City with Rockefeller’s financial backing and collection.
1964	Wednesdays in Mississippi created by Dorothy Height, President of the National Council of Negro Women, and volunteer Polly Cowan; effort sent interracial and

	interfaith teams of women from the north to Mississippi to encourage social and racial justice
1966	National Organization for Women (NOW) founded
1972	Ms. Foundation for Women established as first women's fund organized by women, led by women, and granting funds for women and girls; paved the way for growth of women's funds in communities across U.S. and around the world
1985	Women's Funding Network (WFN) established to strengthen community of women's funds that had proliferated since 1972; today WFN represents more than 160 women's funds around the world
1986	Global Fund for Women founded; by 2012 had allocated more than \$100 million in grants; merged with the International Museum of Women in 2014
1988	First women's philanthropy council in higher education established at the University of Wisconsin
1990	Women Donors Network founded to support progressive change through collaboration and innovation
1997	Women's Philanthropy Institute incorporated as a free-standing nonprofit; moved to the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy in 2004
Late 1990s	Giving circles emerged as a form of participatory collective giving; today giving circles encompass all races, ethnicities, religions, and ages
2004	Women's Leadership Councils established by United Way Worldwide; has grown into a global network representing 55,000 women and has raised more than \$1 billion in 12 years
2006	Women Moving Millions established by sisters Swanee Hunt and Helen LaKelly Hunt to raise million-dollar gifts from women for women and girls
2006	Tiffany Circle Society of Women Leaders created by American Red Cross to raise major gifts from women
2008	NoVo Foundation partners with Nike Foundation on Girl Effect to improve health, education, and finances of adolescent girls living in poverty around the world; this initiative has generated attention, encouraged partnerships and collaborations, and spawned similar efforts
2009	Women's Philanthropy Institute awards first WPI doctoral dissertation fellowship to support emerging scholars in area of women's philanthropy or gender differences in philanthropic behavior; four awards given since 2009
2010	United Nations Foundation launches Girl Up campaign to raise awareness and funds for adolescent girls in developing countries; Plan International adopts "Because I am a Girl" campaign to empower girls and women

This historical context provides an important foundation for the study of women's giving and the challenges and opportunities for women's philanthropy. Further, scholars often address research questions from one disciplinary perspective, which may overlook the importance of women's changing roles over time. Contemporary research on gender and giving draws from numerous data sets and methodological approaches. Before we explore findings on how and why women give, we provide a brief background on how to interpret and differentiate studies; we then review disciplinary theories that inform giving and other prosocial behaviors.

### III. Data and Methods in Research on Women's Philanthropy

Data on giving and volunteering, including data used for a gender analysis, come primarily from three general sources: surveys, experiments, and institutional data. This brief overview is provided to assist in interpreting and understanding the research findings presented below. Table 2 below summarizes these three data sources, provides examples and notes limitations. A full description of each of these methodological approaches is provided in Appendix A.

**Table 2: Data and Methods in Philanthropic Research**

<b>Data/Method</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Example(s)</b>	<b>Limitations</b>
Survey	A sample of the population is asked about their giving behaviors and attitudes; can be online, paper, phone, in-person, etc.	Philanthropy Panel Study (PPS); High Net Worth Study	Samples may not be representative; definitions, measures differ; respondent recall and social desirability bias
Experiment	Laboratory or field experiments where researchers manipulate the setting in order to observe subjects' responses	Ultimatum games, dictator games, fundraising appeals	Difficult to generalize; only indirectly provides insight on charitable giving
Institutional data	Data from nonprofit organizations, payment processors, etc.	Blackbaud donation database; Kiva donor database	Difficult to access; data may not be representative; partnering with institutions is time-consuming and challenging

While a number of data sources and methods have informed the wider field of philanthropy, these approaches each serve different needs. Each approach also has certain benefits and limitations. Some, like lab experiments, may be effective at controlling the environment so that specific theories can be tested; however, these experiments may be more difficult to generalize than field experiments or data from large, nationally representative surveys. Institutional data can be helpful as well, but may not present a representative sample; for example, analyzing a database of donors to a nonprofit may yield findings about those donors, but it does not provide an accurate comparison to a group that has not donated to the organization. Each method can be useful in answering different questions and addressing gaps in the research.

#### **IV. Theories on Gender Differences in Giving**

Before we address research findings on giving and volunteering by men and women, we provide an overview of theories by discipline that can help us understand gender differences in giving. Because philanthropy is an interdisciplinary subject area, it has benefited from exploration by numerous academic perspectives. Economists, psychologists, sociologists, and organizational theorists have each brought their methodological perspectives and research questions to the study of philanthropy and why people engage in prosocial behaviors. Other systematic literature reviews have organized literature according to the mechanisms of giving, crossing disciplinary boundaries (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a). However, we address theories of giving as they relate to gender from these four major disciplines. We first discuss economic theories about why motivations for giving may be different in men and women; these theories tend to focus on the impacts of price of giving, attitudes toward risk, and competition to explain gender differences in giving. Second, we review the social psychological literature, which addresses underlying dispositional characteristics that influence giving. These theories include prosocial motivation and behavior, empathy and altruism, and donor identity. Third, we discuss sociological theories such as social context and social capital in giving. Finally, organizational literature addresses theories of institutions, including support for the nonprofit sector in society and the place of women in nonprofits and society. Within this organizational framework, it should be noted that many disciplines ask similar questions, and terms and concepts frequently overlap. A summary of key findings from this section is in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Major Academic Disciplines Related to Philanthropy**

Academic Discipline	Major Topics and Findings
Economics	<u>Price of Giving</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women give when price of giving is high; men give when price of giving is low (Andreoni &amp; Vesterlund, 2001)</li> </ul> <u>Risk/Social Preference</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women more risk-averse (Croson &amp; Gneezy, 2009)</li> <li>• Women more cooperative (Eckel &amp; Grossman, 2001)</li> </ul>
Psychology	<u>Empathy and Altruism</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women more empathic than men (Hoffman, 1977)</li> <li>• Gender differences in empathy may be due to study design (Eisenberg &amp; Lennon, 1983)</li> <li>• Women give to help others; men focus on benefits they receive by giving (Brunel &amp; Nelson, 2000)</li> </ul> <u>Prosocial Motivation and Gender Roles</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women and men both prosocial; women give emotional support within relationships, men give active support to strangers (Eagley, 2009)</li> </ul>
Sociology	<u>Social Context</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Men take social norms into account when giving; women do not (Meier, 2007)</li> <li>• Women give more when they are socially close to recipients; men do not (Cox &amp; Deck, 2006)</li> </ul> <u>Social Capital</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women's giving is strongly tied to social networks and trust in others (Brown &amp; Farris, 2007; Einolf, 2011)</li> </ul>
Organizational Studies	<u>Support for Nonprofit Sector</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women more committed than men to the role of nonprofits in society (Marx 2000)</li> </ul> <u>Women in Nonprofits and Society</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countries with more empowerment of women are the same countries where people tend to be more involved in nonprofits (Themudo, 2009)</li> </ul>

**A. Economic Approaches**

Economists have been interested in charitable giving since the 1970s. Their research is drawn from applied econometrics, economic theory, game theory, and experimental and behavioral economics (Andreoni & Payne, 2013). The economic theorist is interested in individual and household preferences that motivate the decision to give. One approach is to examine giving as an individual economic decision, where donations are subject to budget constraints. Often charitable donations are responsive to tax incentives, which economists refer to as the price elasticity of giving. In other words, when the cost of donating is reduced, giving increases. Other economic approaches look at the impact of tax policy and government funding; however, these apply less often to an examination of gender and giving.

**Price of Giving.** In a seminal experimental study, Andreoni and Vesterlund (2001) use a modified dictator game to explore gender differences in altruism in an effort to reconcile two prior studies, one which found no sex differences in altruism (Bolton & Katok, 1995) compared with finding significantly<sup>1</sup> higher altruism for women (Eckel & Grossman, 1998). Andreoni and Vesterlund explain these differences by introducing the price of giving into the model. They find that either men or women can be altruistic, but that men are more generous when the price of giving is low, and women are more altruistic when the price of giving is high. In other words, men are more price-elastic. For example, if a donor will receive a tax benefit for giving, it reduces the overall cost of making a gift. Per Andreoni and Vesterlund (2001), men would give more when they receive a tax break, whereas women would give even if a tax benefit were not available. They extend this finding to infer that men are more likely to be either entirely selfish or entirely selfless and that women prefer to share evenly (i.e., making sure payoffs are equal).

In earlier research, Brown and Lankford (1992) studied how tax price impacts donations and volunteering simultaneously. They theorize that volunteering and giving money are complements, so studies that estimate the effect of taxes only on financial contributions underestimate the net effect. The study finds that women's volunteering is more price-elastic; therefore, reducing the marginal tax rate (i.e., increasing the price of giving) will lead women to volunteer significantly less.

**Risk and Social Preferences.** Economists also seek to understand the differences in risk preferences, social preferences, and competition between men and women. In a literature review of economic experiments, Croson and Gneezy (2009) find that women are more risk-averse, inequality-averse, less competitive than men, and more sensitive to social context. In terms of risk preferences, men are more prone than women to taking risks, and tend to view risky situations as challenges as opposed to threats. Moreover, women favor equality in giving, and the authors point to several studies that indicate women are more likely to split experimental endowments equally among experiment participants (Dufwenberg & Muren, 2006; Guth, Schmidt, & Sutter 2007), a finding that echoes Andreoni and Vesterlund's (2001) study above. Eckel and Grossman (2001) performed ultimatum experiments and found that women are generally more generous and more cooperative, regardless of the sex of the partner in the ultimatum game. Further, when women are giving to other women, they almost always reach an agreement. The authors posit that women's generosity is due to their greater aversion to risk and desire to cooperate. In a related article, Miller and Hoffman (1995) link religious behavior to risk aversion, finding that women are more religious than men and are also more averse to risk. List (2004), in a natural experiment simulating a prisoner's dilemma, also finds that women are more likely to cooperate than men. Brown-Kruse & Hummels (1993) tested the hypothesis that women are more cooperative and community-minded than men; however, this hypothesis was not supported in their lab experiment as they found that men contributed to the public good in question at a higher rate. In another study with contradictory results, Ben-Ner, Kong, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the literature review, references are made to statistical significance of findings. When a statistic is significant, it means researchers are quite sure that a statistic is reliable or that a relationship or difference exists. Though this review does not often delve into this level of detail, if a finding is noted to be significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level, this means researchers are at least 95 percent sure that the results are not due to chance. Research findings discussed as significant in this review meet at least the  $p < 0.05$  level.

Putterman (2004) find that women systematically give less money to other women than to men and to people without an identified gender. One explanation for contradictory findings is that women's behaviors are more sensitive to the way experiments are designed (Croson & Gneezy, 2009).

### ***B. Psychological Approaches***

Psychological research on giving is more recent and an expanding field, particularly with respect to gender, and may intersect with multiple disciplines (Andreoni & Payne, 2013). Social psychologists frequently study moral and empathic responses, including helping behavior, altruism, and personal identity. Psychologists distinguish humans from other animals in part by these empathic responses, which include the concept of justice and impressions we make on others in society. Holding such prosocial values generally has a positive association with charitable giving (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a).

***Empathy and Altruism.*** Empathy is a person's ability to understand and share the feelings of another. Sex differences in empathy have been a topic of interest to researchers for decades; as a result, a number of reviews of research and meta-analyses exist. When defined widely to include concepts about socialization, early research finds no differences based on gender (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Block, 1976). In 1977, Hoffman conducted a meta-analysis with a more narrow definition of empathy (separating it from social sensitivity and societal roles) and found that women appear more empathic than men. Women seem to be more apt to imagine themselves in another's place, whereas men are more likely to take action to improve a situation. While both sexes appear equally able to assess another's feelings during an emotional situation, women tend to have a more affective response than men to others' feelings.

Later studies also find gender differences in concern for others' well-being. In studies in the U.S. as well as abroad, researchers find that women are more concerned about the well-being of others, and are less likely to accept materialism and competition (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Einolf, 2011; Mesch, Brown, Moore, & Hayat, 2011). Researchers have posited that gender differences in empathy are likely due to differences in the way men and women are socialized (Beutel & Marini, 1995). Mesch et al. (2011) examined gender, empathic concern, and their relationship to charitable giving. They find that women score higher on measures of empathy, and that empathy is significantly and positively associated with giving for both men and women. They further find that women are more likely to give to charity, and to give a higher amount, even when controlling<sup>2</sup> for motivations.

Eisenberg and Lennon (1983) provide another review of the literature, and find that much of the difference in empathy scores by gender seems to be the result of study design. While studies using self-reported scales found women to be much more empathic than men, lab measurements (such as reflexive crying) showed reduced gender differences, but women were still somewhat more empathetic. Finally, when measurements of physical or other nonverbal

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this literature review, references are made to statistical controls. Controlling for variables means that when researchers look at the effect of one variable in the model, they hold constant all of the other variables in the model. For example, when looking just at raw dollar amounts given by men and women, men may appear to give higher amounts. When controls such as income are added to these models, this may not be the case. In other words, holding income (or other factors) constant, women may give as much or more than men.



reactions to another's emotional state were used, no sex differences were found. In general, their meta-analysis highlighted inconsistencies in both the data and findings in studies of empathy and gender, and attributed those inconsistencies to the various study methodologies.

Empathy is closely related to altruism, which we define as being willing to act in consideration of the interests of others. Altruism has been explored in experiments such as dictator games, and can be difficult to measure (Andreoni, Harbough, & Vesterlund, 2008). As an example, if a study tests whether subjects cooperate, this could be caused by altruism or some other non-altruistic explanation, including the study design. Andreoni et al. (2008) review prior studies of dictator games, including Andreoni and Miller's (2002) study which found that women and men are equally altruistic, but vary their giving in response to the price of giving. Andreoni and Vesterlund (2001) found that men are more likely to maximize total payments to both subjects, where women are more likely to equalize payments to both subjects. Nowell and Tinkler (1994) conducted an experiment on public goods provision, and found that all-female groups tended to be more cooperative and contribute more. Visser and Roelofs (2011) found that gender is important to altruism, but in a more nuanced way that relates to the subjects' personalities. The study included measures of personality factors like agreeableness, emotional stability, and intellect. The authors found that these personality factors explain much of the gender effect in giving.

A number of studies that have examined charitable giving reveal findings related to both empathy and altruistic behavior. Brunel and Nelson (2000) found that women respond more positively to fundraising appeals that focus on helping others, whereas men responded more to appeals that focused on personal benefits of giving, such as tax breaks. A recent study by Willer, Wimer, and Owens (2015) is based on a prior research finding that shows men are less willing to give money or volunteer time to a poverty relief organization than women. The authors found that when poverty was framed as an issue that negatively affects the entire society, men are more willing to donate to the cause, effectively eliminating the gender gap. The authors posit that this is because men give more when their own self-interest is involved in the cause, while women are motivated by an empathic response. U.K. studies have also investigated this question. In a survey of young, wealthy individuals working in the financial and legal sectors in London, Kottasz (2004) finds women are more likely to donate to a charity that serves human needs, and are more motivated by personal recognition than social recognition for their donations. Men are more motivated by social incentives such as invitations to special events. The study did not support the hypotheses that women are more empathic than men and more likely to respond to emotional rather than factual appeals by charities; however, the study sample is quite narrowly defined.

***Prosocial Motivation and Gender Roles.*** Researchers have sought explanations for the gender differences in altruism and empathy outlined above. One reason for gender differences may be due to how men and women have been socialized, with women more likely to show their caring and express emotions, and men more concerned with status and social expectations (Eagley & Crowley, 1986; Eagley, 2009). Alice Eagley is arguably at the forefront of research on gender roles in prosocial behavior. She finds that men and women both exhibit prosocial behavior, but in different ways that seem to mirror gender roles in everyday life. Women tend to be prosocial in community- and relationship-oriented ways, and men tend to be prosocial in strength-oriented ways. Women tend to provide emotional support, especially in

close relationships, whereas men tend to direct their helpfulness to strangers in a more active way (Eagley & Crowley, 1986; Eagley, 2009). An earlier analysis showed that men excel at short-term measures of helpfulness, such as acts of chivalry, like rescuing, that are often directed toward strangers; women are more inclined to care for others, especially those they are close to (Eagley & Crowley, 1986).

Experimental research finds that, while both men and women are inclined to help, they differ in the motivations for these behaviors (Mills et al., 1989; Monk-Turner et al., 2002). When women choose to act altruistically, they were more likely to make their decisions based on empathy; when women made choices benefitting themselves, they were more likely to decide based on minimizing conflict (Mills et al., 1989). Similarly, Monk-Turner et al. (2002) studied helping behavior by having actors drop stacks of books and see whether women or men were more likely to stop and help. They found no significant differences in helping behavior across gender, but did note that of the helpers, women were generally more friendly and sympathetic.

More recent research explores how prosocial motivation and moral identity may influence men and women to participate in charitable giving. Moral identity is the idea that people define themselves using moral issues, such as being a kind or a fair person. For men and women, the role of moral identity has a differing effect on altruistic behavior. Winterich et al. (2009) find that when women have a strong moral identity, they increase donations to out-groups (i.e., international recipients rather than local). When men have a strong moral identity, the reverse takes place (they increase donations to the in-group).

Prosocial motivation and behavior has also been studied internationally. Wiepking and Einolf (2012) use data from 20 European countries and Israel to map two pathways leading women and men to display prosocial behavior. The authors indicate that men are led to give and volunteer because of their higher levels of human resources such as education. Women have an increased likelihood of giving and volunteering because of their motivations and stronger prosocial values. The authors find that women are more likely to donate to charity than men, and men are more likely to volunteer than women when they have the same level of motivations and resources. A study in the Netherlands found that women donate to charity at lower levels than men, when controlling for an individual's level of social resources (relationships, networks) (Wiepking & Maas, 2010). While these results may conflict with other results in the wider literature, this is likely because the data were drawn from non-U.S. countries, and thus, these differences may be explained in part by historic, cultural, or other differences between countries.

### **C. Social Approaches**

Both psychologists and sociologists have examined how individuals are embedded in larger norms, groups, and networks. Social psychological researchers are often interested in how social norms affect individual behavior (Croson, Handy, & Shang, 2010). Sociological research often examines how individuals trust and relate to others in their communities. In general, mechanisms such as reputation, recognition, and the desire to make a difference may encourage individuals to give (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a).

**Social Context.** The social context of giving addresses how individuals' behaviors are affected by external influences and norms, such as other people's behavior. Studies have

examined social norms, social cues, and social distance in both controlled experiments and field research.

A social norm is the typical response of most people in a given setting. For example, people may be more likely to make a charitable contribution when they know others are also doing so, and may even seek to match the amount. A study by Croson, Handy, and Shang (2010) used survey data and a lab experiment to explore social norms for donors to a public radio station, based on receiving information about what other donors gave. The survey found that men are more likely than women to take social norms into consideration when making giving decisions. Experimental data echoed this finding; women's decisions about giving were not significantly related to their belief about the social norm. Meier (2007) found that men tend to align their giving behavior with the average group behavior, but women do not take group behavior into account. Men were more likely to contribute to a charitable fund when they were informed that a high proportion of the population had done so, but the giving rate of women was unchanged. These findings suggest that men are more sensitive to social norms about giving.

DellaVigna, List, Malmendier, and Rao (2013) conduct a field experiment that finds that women are more often on the margins of whether or not to give, and are therefore more sensitive to social preferences. For example, when put under pressure, women may give more; but if given a simple option to decline giving, they may say no. This complements the price sensitivity finding of Andreoni and Vesterlund (2001), and is consistent with the hypothesis that women are more sensitive to social cues. This can explain some contradictory findings between men's and women's giving. If women are more likely to be on the margins, then depending on the study methodology, women will be shown to give more in certain situations but not in others.

Finally, the concept of social distance, or the degree of social separation between the giver and receiver, was addressed by Cox and Deck (2006). Using an experiment, they find that women's generosity is inversely related to social distance. Where social distance is low, women are more likely to give; when social distance is high, women are less likely to give. They find men do not take social distance into account when making charitable or giving decisions.

**Social Capital.** Social capital, an individual's networks and social trust of others and of authority, also impacts giving by men and women (Putnam, 1995). Wang and Graddy (2008) explore this relationship, and how giving differs to religious and secular organizations, using the 2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. High social capital is shown to positively impact both secular and religious giving. While gender is only used as a control variable, the study finds that women contribute significantly less than men to both religious and social causes. Brown and Farris (2007) also explore the impact of social capital on philanthropy using the same Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, but a different regression model. Gender and marital status are included as control variables. They find that women are less likely than men to give to religion, but are more likely than men to volunteer. Results on women's giving to secular causes are mixed: women are more likely than men to give to secular causes when their social capital is not included in the model, but less likely to give to secular causes when social capital is included. Einolf (2011) finds that men have greater secular social networks, while women have larger religious social networks and participation. These studies indicate that some of the difference between women and men in giving to secular causes is due to women's higher levels of social capital; in other words, women's giving is strongly tied to their

social networks and trust in others. Emerging research on giving circles (see section VIII) may also support this survey finding.

Overall, these studies show that women take the broader social context of giving into consideration, including social capital. While women tend to give within their own communities and respond to social cues when deciding to give, they do not tend to place great value on aligning with social norms of other donors in their giving.

#### ***D. Organizational Approaches***

Within the broad field of organizational studies, research also has addressed public perceptions of the nonprofit sector and women's empowerment at an organizational and societal level, including the impact of women on group behavior.

***Support for the Nonprofit Sector.*** Studies have shown that men and women perceive the role of charities in society differently, leading to different giving decisions. In a study of human services organizations in the U.S., using the 1996 wave of the Gallup Poll commissioned by Independent Sector, Marx (2000) finds that women are more committed to the role of nonprofits in society. Women were significantly more likely than men to agree that charitable organizations make communities better places to live, and that it is in their power to help improve the welfare of others.

Similarly, in the 2011 Study of High Net Worth Women's Philanthropy and the Impact of Women's Giving Networks (COP, 2011b)<sup>3</sup> women had statistically significant higher levels of confidence in nonprofits and in individuals to solve the problems that society is facing: 50.4 percent of women, compared to 33.8 percent of men, indicated they have confidence in nonprofits to solve societal problems. These are the highest levels of confidence in any group or type of government or other organization. Both studies suggest that women are more confident in the nonprofit sector, which may positively influence their giving.

***Women's Presence in Nonprofits and Society.*** The status of women in a given country or even in a particular organization can impact how men and women donate and volunteer. Global studies provide insight into how country-level factors may impact philanthropy. Kou, Hayat, Mesch, and Osili (2013) conducted a study of Lions Clubs members in 14 countries, including the U.S. They find that when an individual belongs to a club where at least half the members are female, and where the club experiences an increase in the percentage of its female membership, the individual (whether male or female) is more likely to donate and also tends to donate more to their club. This suggests that when women's participation in organizations reaches a critical mass, women have an increasing impact on how the organization and its members function, and the presence of women in the organization influences individuals to give more.

Themudo (2009) analyzes two global data sets to explore the relationship between women's empowerment, volunteering, and the strength of the nonprofit sector. The author notes that in the U.S., women are more likely to both be members in and volunteer for nonprofits; however, the opposite is true for all countries taken together. Themudo finds that higher levels of women's country-level empowerment are positively associated with higher levels of

---

<sup>3</sup> The Bank of America/U.S. Trust Studies of High Net Worth Philanthropy define high net worth households as having a net worth of \$1 million or more (excluding the value of their primary residence) and/or an annual household income of \$200,000 or more (COP, 2011b).

membership and volunteering across all nonprofit fields, and posits that lower levels of women's empowerment stifle women's natural public-spiritedness. He further finds that women's empowerment correlates with volunteering and total nonprofit employment; in other words, when countries have greater women's empowerment, they have larger nonprofit sectors and women volunteer more often. These two studies indicate that the presence of women in society and in voluntary organizations can influence giving and volunteering by men and women and varies according to country context.

While the literature discusses a number of potential motivations and influences on giving and volunteering, results can sometimes be mixed. Overall, men seem to be more motivated by external factors, such as social recognition and the giving behavior of others. Women seem to be more intrinsically motivated, to the point of giving sacrificially when price of giving is high (Andreoni & Vesterlund, 2001). Women tend to have a greater sense of moral identity, empathy, and inclination to help others. Further, social context matters for women; they prefer to give to their local community. Finally, the larger social, economic, and political context matters for charitable giving matters as well. In countries where women are more empowered, and in organizations where their input is valued, women are found to participate in philanthropy more.

## V. Gender Differences in Giving

Do women give differently than men? To date, a number of academic studies have investigated how giving behavior by men and women differs. Empirical research ranges from economic experiments and simulations, to large-scale surveys and regression analysis. We explore this question by summarizing research findings on several aspects of giving behavior: the likelihood of giving, the amount given, how gifts are distributed, and salient donor characteristics. While the literature is not unified on all points, often due, in part, to study methodologies, the majority of studies find that women make different giving decisions than men; specifically, they tend to be more generous. Table 4 presents a summary of key results on gender differences in the likelihood and amount of giving.

***Likelihood of Giving.*** At the most basic level, many studies seek to address whether there is a measurable difference in the likelihood of giving between men and women. In general, studies find that women are more likely to make a donation than men (Greer, 2000; Harvey, 1990; Jones & Posnett, 1991; Mesch, 2010; Weyant, 1984). This finding is consistent across experimental and survey research. From their experimental research, Eckel and Grossman (1998) generally agree that women are more likely to give than men. In a natural experiment with a university capital campaign, List (2004) finds that women are more likely to give (4.6 percent for women and 4.2 percent for men, a statistically significant difference), but finds no significant difference in the amount given. Studies from the United Kingdom largely confirm U.S. findings (Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009; Piper & Schnepf, 2008). For example, Belfield and Beney (2000) looked at giving to two public universities in the U.K. and find that women have a higher probability of giving. In the Netherlands, women are no more likely to make a charitable donation than men, but may be more apt to recall a household's charitable donations (Bekkers, 2006; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2006).

One challenge to understanding men's and women's giving is that survey data are often collected at the household level and married couples' giving is combined together. To address this, several studies isolate their analysis to households headed by single men and single women, so that giving by married couples does not confuse the results. Osili, Miller, and Mesch (2010) looked at PPS data from 2007 for single-headed households only and found that female donors are significantly more likely to give than men; this replicates Mesch, Rooney, Steinberg, and Denton's (2006) finding that single women are more likely to give than single men. Mesch (2010) further finds that female-headed households are more likely or as likely to give to every charitable subsector as compared with male-headed households. Brown, Mesch, and Hayat (2014) took an even smaller sample of single men and women born before 1965 from the PSID waves from 2003 through 2007, and find that being female increases the likelihood that a person would donate to charity. In an earlier study, Rooney, Mesch, Chin, and Steinberg (2005) find that women are more likely to give than men, but there are interesting effects by gender. Single and married females are most likely to donate compared to married males, who in turn, were more likely to donate than single males.

At least one study has found that men are more likely to give than women in a group setting revealing a contradictory result. Brown-Kruse and Hummels (1993) conducted a lab experiment where participants were divided into same-sex groups and could contribute to a group fund. They find males contribute at a higher rate than females, but this experiment may

also reflect group influences. In the Netherlands, a field experiment that took place in a survey setting found that men were more likely to give to one of three health-related charities, but did not give higher amounts than women (Bekkers, 2007).

In addition to financial donations, giving behavior by gender also has been studied among body and organ donations. In a study by Meslin, Rooney, and Woolf (2008), where data were collected from a public opinion survey, the authors find that women are less likely than men to have donated blood during their lifetime, but are more likely to be registered organ donors. They find no gender differences in the probability of donating one's body to science or academia after death.

**Table 4: Findings on Incidence and Amount of Donations by Gender**

<b>Study</b>	<b>Data Source/Method</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Mesch (2010)	PPS 2007 (survey); singles only	Women more likely	Women give more	International, community, religious, health, youth/family have greatest difference in incidence of giving (women more likely)
Piper & Schnepf (2008)	ONS Omnibus Survey (UK)	Women more likely	Women give more	Likelihood: W>M for all sectors; except M>W for sports, "other". Amount: Animals, education, elderly, hospitals, children have greatest difference in amount of giving (W>M); except M>W to religion
Brown et al. (2014)	PPS 2003-2007 (survey)	Women more likely	Women give more	N/A
Mesch et al. (2006)	Surveys (using eight methodologies) of Indiana households; singles only	Women more likely	Women give more	N/A
Rooney et al. (2005)	Surveys (using eight methodologies) of U.S. households; singles only	Women more likely	Women give more	N/A
Belfield & Beney (2000)	Alumni giving data from two universities (UK) (administrative data)	Women more likely	Men give more	Higher education is only subsector studied
List (2004)	Natural experiment with University of Central Florida capital campaign	Women more likely	No difference	Higher education is only subsector studied
Micklewright & Schnepf (2009)	ONS Omnibus Survey (UK)	Women more likely	No difference	Overseas (including disaster relief) is only subsector studied
Brown-Kruse & Hummels (1993)	Lab experiment (public goods provision game)	Men more likely	N/A	N/A
Bekkers (2007)	Field experiment embedded in a large, random sample survey (Netherlands)	Men more likely	No difference	Recipient choices were limited to one of three health-related organizations
Bekkers (2006)	Family Survey of the Dutch Population (Netherlands)	No difference	Men give more	N/A
Eckel & Grossman (1998)	Lab experiment (dictator game)	N/A	Women give more	N/A
Eckel et al. (2005)	Lab experiment (dictator game)	N/A	Women give more	N/A



Study	Data Source/Method	Likelihood	Amount	Sector
Leslie et al. (2013)	Employee data from a large university workplace giving campaign (administrative data)	N/A	Women give more	N/A
Simmons & Emmanuel (2007)	Giving and Volunteering 1999 (survey)	N/A	Women give more	N/A
Chang (2005)	Survey of Social Development Trends (Taiwan)	N/A	Women give more	Women gave more to charitable, medical, and religious organizations; no difference for academic organizations
Jackson & Latané (1981)	Field experiment on door-to-door solicitation	N/A	Men give more	Health is only subsector studied
Okunade (1996)	Alumni giving data from University of Memphis (administrative data)	N/A	Men give more	Higher education is only subsector studied
Shapiro & Ridinger (2011)	Survey of donors to athletics at three NCAA Div. I universities	N/A	Men give more	Higher education (specifically athletics) is only subsector studied
Bekkers & Schuyt (2008)	Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey (GINPS), 2002	N/A	Men give more to religious organizations	
Bolton & Katok (1995)	Lab experiment (dictator game)	N/A	No difference	N/A
Cadsby et al. (2010)	Lab experiment (dictator game)	N/A	No difference	N/A
Kottasz (2004)	Survey of young wealthy professionals in London (UK)	N/A	No difference	N/A
Wunnava & Lauze (2001)	Alumni giving data from Middlebury College (VT) (administrative data)	N/A	No difference	N/A
Andreoni & Vesterlund (2001)	Lab experiment (dictator game)	N/A	Varies based on price of giving	N/A

**Amount of Donations.** Since the vast majority of studies generally find that women are more likely to give than men, we now review how the amount of donations differs according to gender. These studies lack the same level of consensus among their findings, with a number of scholars finding that women give more, others finding that women give less, some finding no difference, and some attempting to untangle the differences between individual studies. As

women's educational attainment and incomes have increased over time, we might expect their charitable giving to increase as well. However, there may be other demands on women's resources, and not all groups of women have experienced equal social and economic gains.

A handful of studies that focus on specific organizations or donor populations find that men give higher donation amounts. In an early study, Jackson and Latané (1981) studied door-to-door solicitations for the Leukemia Society of America and find that male respondents donated more than females. Okunade (1996), looking at University of Memphis alumni giving data, finds that male alumni donated significantly more than female alumni; however, the author cautions that this could be due to male graduates historically having higher incomes. Shapiro and Ridinger (2011) studied gender and giving to college athletics at three NCAA Division I universities, and find that female donors made smaller contributions than men. These studies' findings could all be explained, at least in part, by their unique samples. Similarly, Belfield and Beney (2000), looking at alumni giving data from two UK universities, find that being female is negatively associated with the amount of a gift. However, the context for higher education does differ in the U.S. and U.K.

A number of other, more generalizable studies find that women give higher amounts of money than men (Eckel & Grossman, 1998; Eckel et al., 2005; Piper & Schnepf, 2008; Simmons & Emmanuel, 2007). In general, the experimental research finds that women give more than men (for example, Eckel & Grossman, 1998; Eckel et al., 2005). U.K. studies have affirmed these findings, including Piper and Schnepf (2008), who use the U.K. Omnibus survey. They find that women give more than men when controlling for variables like household structure, education, and income. In contrast, studies in the Netherlands find that men make larger donations than women to religious organizations, which may account for men's higher total giving in surveys that treat all donations together (Bekkers, 2006; Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008). In a large-scale survey in Taiwan, Chang (2005) found that women gave higher amounts to charitable, medical, and religious causes, but found no difference in giving to academic organizations.

Again, a number of studies look at only single men and single women and either exclude or compare them with married couples. The majority of studies that examine only single men and single women find that single women give more than single men (Brown et al, 2014; Mesch et al., 2006; Osili, Miller, & Mesch, 2010). Mesch et al. (2006) find that single women give more than single men, although married couples give more than single people of either sex. Although their sample is a bit older (single people born before 1965), Brown et al. (2014) find that women give more than men. The authors are concerned with a segment of the population of mature single women and men. The authors find no evidence of a greater propensity for mature single women than for mature single men to give less than would be expected, taking into consideration their life expectancy and the resources available. In fact, they find that mature women actually give more (Brown et al., 2014).

Women's higher levels of giving may also affect the behavior of other members in a group, such as a workplace or voluntary association. In a study of workplace charitable giving, Leslie, Snyder, and Glomb (2013) find that women donate more than men in workplace giving campaigns and programs. Interestingly, this study notes that men give more to such giving programs when they work in a unit with a higher percentage of women. Kou et al. (2013), in a study of Lions Clubs in 14 countries, have a similar finding on the influence of women: when an

individual belongs to a club where at least half the members are female, and where the club experiences an increase in the percentage of female members, the individual (whether male or female) is more likely to donate and also tends to donate more to their club.

Finally, some studies find no gender effect on the amount given (Bekkers, 2007; Bolton & Katok, 1995; Cadsby, Servátka, & Song, 2010; Kottasz, 2004; Wunnava & Lauze, 2001). In one of the first lab tests for gender differences in generosity using a dictator game, where the subject divides the money between herself and someone else, the authors find no gender effect (Bolton & Katok, 1995). Cadsby et al. (2010) also conducted a study using a dictator game, finding no gender effect for the mean or median levels of giving, but did find that women were more likely than men to give away half (the maximum percentage) of their endowment. Kottasz (2004), in his study of wealthy young professionals in London, found that women did not give more to charity than men. This study may be difficult to generalize to the United States due to a narrowly defined sample, as well as a small sample size. Finally, Andreoni and Vesterlund (2001), in an attempt to reconcile prior findings, conclude that either men or women can be altruistic, but that men are more generous when the price of giving is low, and women are more altruistic when the price of giving is high.

A number of the most generalizable studies, which use survey data and dictator games, conclude that women give more than men, especially when controls such as income and wealth are introduced. While some studies find no gender differences, men's giving tends only to be higher in specific organizational contexts such as universities and sports programs. However, the existence of mixed findings demonstrates that this question should continue to be examined with larger, more representative samples as research continues.

**Distribution of Gifts.** We next consider how men and women distribute their gifts among nonprofit organizations. Do men and women distribute their giving among a similar number of charities? Are men and women drawn to different causes to support? Most studies show that men and women distribute their gifts to different charitable subsectors. Using survey data, Andreoni, Brown, and Rischall (2003) find that women spread their dollars more thinly across a larger number of organizations, whereas men tend to concentrate their giving to a smaller number of organizations. In the U.K., Piper and Schnepf (2008) also support this conclusion and also find that women tend to support more causes than men.

Other studies find that women and men support different causes. Women are more likely to support religious, international, health, social service, education, and community causes, whereas men demonstrate a stronger preference for adult recreation and sports (Andreoni et al., 2003; Marx, 2000; Mesch, 2010; Micklewright & Schnepf, 2009). The *Women Give 2010* report finds that single female-headed households are significantly more likely than single male-headed households to give to the international, religious, health, youth and family, or community causes (Mesch, 2010). Studies have also found that women are more likely to give or to be active donors to specific health causes such as for lung health or birth defects (Keyt, Yavas, & Riecken, 2008; Midlarsky & Hannah, 1989). While Israel (2007) finds that women are more likely to give to the environmental subsector, she does conclude that men give higher absolute dollar amounts. The distribution of gifts by high net worth donors seems to be one exception to these gender differences: the 2011 Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy found no significant differences in the way high net worth men and women distribute their giving across subsectors (COP, 2011b).

While religion is frequently treated as one charitable subsector among many, some studies divide giving into religious and secular causes as two large “buckets” of charitable organizations. For example, Yen (2002) finds that women donate more than men to religious causes, but finds no gender difference in giving to secular causes or in the total amount given. In a contradictory finding, Meslin, Rooney, and Woolf (2008) find that men give more to religious organizations than women, holding other factors constant; however, these two studies used different data sources, which may explain some of the differences in their findings. A study in the Netherlands also found men tended to give more to religious organizations, but found no gender difference in the amount donated to secular organizations (Bekkers & Schuyt, 2008). It is important to remember that not all studies separate giving to religious and secular causes.

**Bequest Giving.** We turn now to the question of bequest giving. Generally, this subject has not been explored in depth, especially with regard to gender. We also reference both U.S. and U.K. studies due to the small body of research. Although there is limited research on the subject, work to date suggests that women are more likely to make a bequest than men, but tend to bequeath about an equal portion in terms of their net worth (Atkinson, Backus, & Micklewright, 2009; Dawson, Grattan, Lundy, Glenn, & Cran, 2003; Eller, 2001; Sargeant, Wymer, & Hilton, 2006). We also note differences in the types of charities that receive bequests based upon the donor's gender.

Atkinson, Backus, and Micklewright (2009) provide a review of U.S. and British literature on bequest giving, and also analyze data on individual estates in Britain that went through probate. They note that women are more likely to make charitable bequests than men; this finding is echoed in multiple other studies (Dawson et al., 2003; Eller, 2001; and Sargeant, Wymer, & Hilton, 2006). Bequest pledgers are largely female (68.7 percent) and are significantly more likely to be female than non-pledgers (Sargeant et al., 2006). Atkinson et al. (2009) note that much of the literature on this subject in the U.S. is centered on the impact of estate taxes; to date, little has been written to expand beyond that subject.

This limited research on bequest giving also demonstrates that bequests flow to different types of nonprofits depending on the sex of the donor. Eller (2001) found that 38 percent of bequests by men to charity went to private foundations, compared to just 19 percent of bequests by women. Women are more likely to provide a bequest to a religious organization than men (14 percent and 5 percent, respectively).

**Demographic Factors.** As studies with demographic controls show that women tend to give and give more than men, investigating the influence of individual characteristics such as age, marriage, and religious affiliation reveals more complex giving patterns and influences. First, donor age has varying impacts by gender. List (2004) finds that older subjects contribute more than young and middle-aged subjects. Women seem to give consistently over time; in other words, as they get older, their giving does not significantly increase with age. Men, on the other hand, give less when they are young and increase their giving significantly as they get older (List, 2004).

Second, whether a donor is married or not has differing impacts for giving and volunteering by men and women. Overall, marriage typically results in higher levels of charitable giving (Brooks, 2007). Einolf and Philbrick (2014) use PSID data from 2001 through 2009 to explore the impact of getting married, and find that marriage makes men more likely to give to charity, and to give larger amounts. Further, the effect was stronger on religious giving for men,

and it was stronger the longer the participants were married. On the other hand, marriage makes women less likely to volunteer, and married women also drastically reduce their hours volunteered. For women, marriage does not have an impact on overall charitable giving, but it does have a positive effect on religious giving (Einolf & Philbrick, 2014). One study from the U.K. (Belfield & Beney, 2000) differs from the rest of the literature. This study finds that married couples are less likely to give, and that they give less than single people. This difference may be due to the unique sample for the paper, alumni from two public universities in the United Kingdom, which is not likely to represent the preferences of average American households. In comparison, Piper and Schnepf (2008) find that, toward the lower end of the income distribution, married women tend to give more to charity than married men. Rooney et al. (2005) find that single and married females are more likely to donate than married males, who are themselves more likely to donate than single males. Mesch et al. (2006) echo these findings, and the authors suggest that since being married or a single female is associated with an increase in the probability of giving, women may serve the purpose of socializing men to philanthropy, reinforcing the social role theory described above.

Third, a donor's religion also has impacts for giving by gender. Hughes and Luksetich (2008) studied PSID data for married couples, and find that religious donations are lower when both spouses are not religiously affiliated. When the wife is not religious, households tend to give to education and need-based organizations. When the husband ("head of household") is not religious, households tend to give less to multipurpose organizations. A Catholic or Jewish head of household is associated with giving more to health. Mesch, Moore, and Ottoni-Wilhelm (2010) explored Jewish philanthropy by gender. They find that Jewish women married to non-Jewish men were significantly less likely to give at all, and gave less, than all other groups; these couples also gave less specifically to secular nonprofits. Single Jewish men were most likely to give and to give more to secular causes; this group also gave more to religious causes than other singles. These findings are at odds with some previous research and should be explored further. One possible issue is the small sample size, especially of single Jewish men. Finally, the *Women Give 2014* report explored the intersection between religiosity, gender, and age related to charitable giving. The authors find that among younger single people who are religiously unaffiliated, young women give approximately two times more money to charity than do young men (Women's Philanthropy Institute [WPI], 2014).

**Strategy in Giving.** A final point to consider is how men and women plan their charitable giving. While this is often not a question in general U.S. surveys, surveys of high net worth donors ask about giving strategy. High net worth women are significantly more likely to have a strategy and/or a budget for their own giving than are men (78.4 percent and 71.9 percent for women and men, respectively) (COP, 2011b). This indicates that high net worth women are more inclined to plan their giving and to use a budget and strategy for their giving.

While the literature is not unified on all points, it is clear that women do give differently than men in several ways. Women are more likely to give to charity and tend to give more when income and other demographic factors are held constant. Women also tend to "spread their wealth" around, giving smaller amounts to a larger number of nonprofits than men. These findings depend on the age, religion, and marital status of the donor, and men's and women's giving differs with respect to each of these individual donor variables.

## VI. Household Decision Making and Charitable Giving

While a variety of economic, psychological, and sociological research finds significant differences between the giving behavior of individual men and women, charitable giving decisions are often made jointly as part of a married couple. Thus, researchers explain that “one good that is usually a public good in the household is the family’s charitable giving” (Andreoni, Brown, & Rischall, 2003, p. 112). As such, couples may either agree or disagree on charitable preferences, leading to either unanimous agreement or bargaining over giving decisions. One can imagine, if the partners in a couple share the same preferences for an organization, such as a common alma mater, then giving to this organization would be more of a priority in their household budget. However, if the husband prefers to support his local YMCA, and his wife prefers the children’s museum, this sets up a potential conflict over which the couple may need to bargain (Andreoni et al., 2003; Brown, 2005). If the couple chooses not to bargain, they can either defer to the wishes of one partner, or make separate decisions (Brown, 2005).

The dominant household financial management system is for couples to pool their income (Pahl, 1995). Second, charitable decisions are often handled in the same way as money is generally managed within the household, although it occupies a more marginal position (Burgoyne, Young, & Walker, 2005). Burgoyne et al. (2005) conclude, “If both partners agree that they want to give to certain causes on a regular basis, then this gets discussed and built into the normal household outgoing” (p. 395). Further, they find larger and planned/regular gifts to charity tend to be joint decisions, whereas smaller and more spontaneous gifts are more likely to be individual decisions (Burgoyne, et al., 2005). Several scholars have studied household charitable decision making and, specifically, the influence of gender on the likelihood and outcome of the question of “Who decides?”

Andreoni et al. (2003) published one of the seminal studies on intra-household decision making on charitable giving by married couples using data from Independent Sector’s 1992 and 1994 studies on giving and volunteering. They characterize couples in three ways: husband decides, wife decides, or the couple makes decisions jointly. As Table 5 shows below, the majority of couples report making giving decisions jointly, ranging from a low of 53 percent (in Andreoni et al.’s study) to a high of 75.8 percent from a 2003 survey (Rooney et al., 2007).

**Table 5. Self-Reported Household Data on Who Decides**

<b>Study</b>	<b># of Households Surveyed</b>	<b>Joint/Couple Decides</b>	<b>Husband Decides</b>	<b>Wife Decides</b>	<b>Decide Separately</b>
Andreoni, Brown, & Rischall (2003)	2,560	53%	19%	28%	N/A
Brown (2005)	N/A	74.2%	3.3%	7.3%	15.3%
Rooney, Brown, & Mesch (2007) <sup>4</sup>	3,728	75.8%	3.2%	6%	15%
Wiepking & Bekkers (2010) (Netherlands)	1,101	60.5%	8.4%	15.2%	16%
Yörük (2010)	2,300	51%	14%	16%	9%

---

<sup>4</sup> Rooney et al. (2007) studied gifts to only the education subsector.

---

Andreoni et al. (2003) then examine the question of household decision making along three potential differences: whether households give, how much they give, and to what types of organizations they give. The authors find with respect to the likelihood of making a gift, income is only significant for joint deciders, whereas if the husband or wife control decision making, then they are more likely to have higher educational attainment than their spouse. For joint decision makers, a husband's educational attainment is significant, but not the wife's. A similar pattern appears for total giving (amount), where only the decision maker's own educational attainment is significant, except in married couples where only the husband's education is significant. Households where the male partner decides make the largest donations, whereas female deciders and joint deciders are smaller donors (Andreoni et al., 2003; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2010). Home ownership and church attendance have been found to predict couples deciding jointly, whereas having been divorced yields a larger probability of giving separately (Wiepking & Bekkers, 2010). Religious beliefs may also influence decision making. In particular, Wiepking and Bekkers (2010) find that couples belonging to a more conservative religious denomination are more likely to have the male partner make giving decisions.

Couples who make decisions together strongly suggest a model of household bargaining. Andreoni et al. (2003) show that when married households compromise, they tend to resolve conflicts in favor of the husband's preferences, finding decisions to be composed of 68 percent of the male preference and 26 percent of the female preference. Thus, husbands have roughly two and a half times as much influence as wives (Brown, 2005). Yörük (2010) also finds significant differences between the giving behavior of wife-deciders and joint-deciders, and in contrast to Andreoni et al., between husband-deciders and joint-deciders. However, Yörük (2010) finds the husband's preferences prevail when joint-deciders give to health, education, art, neighborhood, international, and environmental organizations.

More specifically, when a couple gives jointly, does the bargaining process reduce the amount given due to the need to compromise, or does giving increase as a result of trying to satisfy both people? Andreoni et al. (2003) find that the bargaining process among joint-deciders is costly to giving, reducing charitable giving by at least 6 percent. However, using more recent data, Yörük (2010), finds that bargaining over giving (joint decision making) may actually increase the amount given to charity by as much as 7 percent. This is even true for those couples who allocate money to different types of charities (Yörük, 2010). Similarly, another study found that separately-deciding households donate the lowest amounts (Wiepking & Bekkers, 2010). In an experimental study involving unmarried, mixed-sex pairs of students, mixed-sex pairs gave more than their same-sex counterparts and more than the sum of their individual gifts (Kamas, Preston, & Baum, 2008). The authors attribute this to the combined effects of social information, negotiation, and social image, which lead less altruistic partners (usually men) to give more than they otherwise would. Thus, women have more influence in the joint decision of how much to give and behave more altruistically (Kamas et al., 2008). Toppe (2002) finds that couples who give jointly gave away 3.4 percent of household income, which was significantly higher than the 2.9 percent of household income given when one partner made the decision alone.

How do couples decide who will make charitable giving decisions? Studies more consistently show that if husbands have greater educational attainment relative to their wives,

there is a greater likelihood they are the decision maker, but if both members have high educational attainment, they are more likely to decide jointly (Andreoni et al., 2003; Yörük, 2010; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2010). Who the primary earner is within a couple may also influence who decides. Both Yörük (2010) and Andreoni, et al. (2003) find that if the husband is the primary earner, he is far more likely to decide how to allocate money to charities. Studies show mixed evidence on whether this influences the probability that the couple decides; Wiepking and Bekkers (2010) do not find an effect of partners' relative financial resources on decision making authority. Both education and income are measures generally associated with bargaining power; therefore, if women continue to increase their levels of education and earnings as recent trends indicate, it would be expected that women would gain more influence over their families' charitable giving (Brown, 2005).

Gender differences grow even larger when we examine how gifts are distributed, again, amplifying the effects found among individuals. Choosing a charity to give to is often a reflection of personal choice, reflecting individuals' interests and concerns expressed through the act of giving (Burgoyne et al., 2005). Among married people, Andreoni et al. (2003) find that women are more likely than men to give to all but two categories—adult-recreation and public benefit. Yörük (2010) finds that husband-deciding and wife-deciding couples make significantly different contribution amounts for every type of charity except arts organizations. Both studies find that when the woman is the decision maker, she will allocate charitable dollars differently, preferring to give to more charities, but giving less to each; whereas married male decision makers tend to concentrate their giving significantly more (Andreoni et al., 2003; Yörük, 2010). Wives who control household charitable giving are significantly more likely to give to health and education than a husband or jointly deciding couple, and wives are more likely to give to human services than a couple (Andreoni et al., 2003). Husbands are significantly more likely to give to adult recreation (Andreoni et al., 2003). Andreoni et al. (2003) find that when couples decide jointly, their giving patterns most closely resemble when males decide alone, again supporting the husband's preferences; however, Yörük (2010) does not find a significant difference here.

Rooney, Brown, and Mesch (2007) restricted their study of married couples to giving to educational institutions. Similar to Andreoni et al.'s (2003) findings, they report that the educational attainment of both spouses and income is positively associated with increased giving to education. Rooney et al. (2007) also find that the number of children in the home, wealth, and the age of the wife are positively associated with increased giving to education, factors Andreoni et al. had not examined. Also similar to Andreoni et al.'s findings, Rooney et al. (2007) find that women decision makers are more likely to have a positive effect on both the likelihood of giving to education and the amount of giving to education, and that men are not likely to influence the decision to give or gift amount. They write, "While women may suffer from a pay gap in the labor market, men seem to suffer from an influence gap in the philanthropic giving decision-making sphere" (Rooney et al., 2007, p. 240). Surprisingly, they find holding all other factors constant, couples that decide on giving separately are significantly more likely to give to education than households that decide jointly.

The existing research poses a number of contradictory findings, but several clear conclusions also emerge. A majority of married couples make giving decisions jointly, particularly for larger and planned gifts. Second, educational levels consistently enhance decision-making power and when both individuals have high average education, they decide on



gifts together. Finally, the gender of the decision maker does matter. Women give to different causes than men, are more likely to give and give more to education, and tend to spread giving around to more organizations when they are responsible for charitable giving.

## VII. Gender and Volunteering

Volunteering, like giving, is a prosocial behavior and can also serve as a measure of philanthropic participation. A variety of U.S.-based surveys have gathered data on volunteer rates, the types of organizations with which people volunteer, and what motivates people to volunteer. Importantly, these surveys focus on volunteer activities that are unpaid and completed through a formal organization, that is, they exclude the informal help one gives to friends or family. Historically and today, women have been more active volunteers than men (Wuthnow, 1995).

National surveys – ranging from the Philanthropy Panel Study to the Current Population Survey – consistently find that women volunteer at a higher rate than men (Burns, Reid, Toncar, Anderson, & Wells, 2008; Einolf, 2011; Nesbit, 2010; Sokolowski, 1996; Taniguchi, 2006; Toppe, 2002). The *Women Give 2013* report finds that among children ages eight and up, girls are significantly more likely to volunteer than boys (WPI, 2013). Nesbit's (2010) comparison of two U.S. data sets finds that about 33 percent of women volunteer compared to between 26 and 29 percent of men. Surveys also consistently find that among those who do volunteer, women volunteer for more hours than men, with exceptions attributed to survey prompts and proxy responses (Einolf, 2011; Nesbit, 2010; Simmons & Emmanuel, 2007; Taniguchi, 2006; Toppe, 2002). A key outlier to both findings above is Wymer & Samu (2002), who draw on a convenience sample of existing volunteers. High net worth women also volunteer at higher rates than high net worth men, although both men and women in high net worth households are much more likely to volunteer and volunteer more hours than the average population (COP, 2011b). The gender difference is even more apparent among single women and single men: single women volunteer at almost twice the rate of single men and volunteer more hours than single men (Mesch et al., 2006).

Global studies reveal that men's and women's volunteer patterns often vary according to country context. Using data from the World Values survey, Themudo (2009) also finds U.S. women are more likely than men to volunteer in nonprofit organizations and be members of nonprofit organizations, but that worldwide, slightly more men volunteer than women, which he attributes to a higher level of women's empowerment in the U.S. Similar to Themudo's results, in most European countries, studies have found that men volunteer more than women (Wiepking & Einolf, 2012).

**Motivations.** A number of studies have also examined volunteer motivations drawing on gender socialization and social role theory to help understand why men's and women's motivations may differ and why women may derive greater satisfaction and rewards from volunteering (Fletcher & Major, 2004; Wymer & Samu, 2002). These theories posit that from an early age women are socialized into more helping, nurturing, and caring roles, demonstrating empathy for others, while men are socialized into heroic and chivalrous roles that are more task-oriented, which leads women to volunteer more (Einolf, 2011). Incorporating both social learning theory and biological differences, Wymer (2011) finds that women prefer helping people in need and organizations that help infants and children, while men prefer volunteer roles that include some level of risk-taking. Similarly, women prefer to volunteer for organizations that are people-oriented, emphasize community, and value volunteer input (Wymer, 2011). In a global study, this may be reflected in the fact that more women than men report valuing service to others as

important, feel it is important to provide for basic human needs, and support an increased government role in reducing poverty (Themudo, 2009).

A popular instrument used to measure motivations is the Volunteer Functions Inventory, which groups motives into six functions: to express one's values; use one's knowledge or skills; enhance one's personal growth; improve career-relevant skills; engage with friends; and manage guilt (Clary et al., 1998). In a study of medical students, Fletcher and Major (2004) found that women rated all six functions higher than men. While both genders rated altruistic motives highly, women also rated the instrumental motives at least as highly as men, a finding that contradicted prior studies. Wymer and Samu (2002) find that female volunteers weighted empathy, and the values of "a sense of accomplishment," "a world at peace," and "mature love" more heavily than men, while men more heavily weighted "a world of beauty," "self-respect," "social recognition," and "true friendship."

**Role of Employment.** Another explanation for women's higher rates of volunteerism is that they may have greater discretionary time than men due to lower levels of labor-market participation. Carlin (2001) finds that in the 1970s and 1980s married women who worked began reducing their volunteer participation and the amount of time they volunteered. However, this was also the time period where greater numbers of women were entering professional careers, where volunteering is a normal part of one's career. As women's formal employment rates have increased, have they continued to volunteer more than men?

Scholars who have examined employment and volunteering from a gender framework offer important insights. Taniguchi (2006) examines the gendered pattern of volunteer work, which is formal and unpaid, building on the more numerous studies of the gendered patterns of paid work (formal) and family work (informal and unpaid). Taniguchi finds that the process of volunteering is gender specific with respect to employment and family responsibilities. While there is no difference between men who work full-time or part-time, women who work part-time are more likely to volunteer and volunteer more than women who work full-time, suggesting women may be under more pressure to balance career and civic responsibilities (Taniguchi, 2006). Another important finding is that unemployment significantly reduces men's participation in volunteering, but has no comparable effect on women (Taniguchi, 2006). Students, retirees, and full-time homemakers, regardless of gender, were also significantly more likely to volunteer (Taniguchi, 2006). Einolf (2011) finds that people employed part-time were more likely to volunteer than either full-time employees or people who do not work. He also concludes that women's greater involvement in informal helping and housework does not prevent them from volunteering.

**Other Determining Factors.** A number of other characteristics have been found to influence volunteering, including social ties, personal values, and demographic variables. Sokolwski (1996) finds altruism and the desire for self-improvement to be significant predictors of volunteering. Social ties, in the form of being a member of an organization, having more diverse friendships, and engaging in informal social networking also increase the likelihood that one will volunteer (Forbes & Zampelli, 2014; Sokolwski, 1996). Individuals who participate in more religious/church activities are more likely to volunteer and also volunteer for more hours (Forbes & Zampelli, 2014). Believing that one's actions will make a difference and taking pride in one's community are also positively related to volunteering (Forbes & Zampelli, 2014).

Individual factors, such as educational attainment, are positively correlated with volunteering across nearly all studies, particularly among respondents with more than a high school education (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Forbes & Zampelli, 2014; Mesch et al., 2006; Taniguchi, 2006; Themudo, 2009; Wang & Graddy, 2008). Some studies find that income is positively correlated with the likelihood of being a volunteer (Mesch et al., 2006; Themudo, 2009), while others find no effect (Forbes & Zampelli, 2014). Einolf (2011) finds that men, on average, possess more education and higher incomes than women, giving them more human capital resources. Higher educational attainment might also enlarge a person's world view, increasing both his or her associational networks and diversifying those networks, as well as enhancing social trust.

Other demographic factors have produced mixed results in studies on volunteering. Age does not seem to be a significant predictor of volunteering (Einolf, 2011; Forbes & Zampelli, 2014; Mesch et al., 2006; Themudo, 2009), though some studies do find positive effects among older individuals (Simmons & Emmanuel, 2007; Taniguchi, 2006). There are mixed results as to whether various racial/ethnic groups have different propensities to volunteer (Einolf, 2011; Mesch et al., 2006). Personal characteristics, such as marital status and the presence of children, are also thought to be important as they draw people into new social networks and having children may present new volunteer opportunities. Being married has produced mixed effects, sometimes increasing the likelihood of volunteering for men (Einolf & Philbrick, 2014; Taniguchi, 2006) or decreasing the likelihood of volunteering and number of hours volunteered for women, at least in the first few years after marriage (Einolf & Philbrick, 2014). This marriage trend may somewhat reverse itself over the long term, as studies find the presence of school-aged children positively influence volunteering, while children under age six may have a negative or no influence on volunteering (Carlin, 2001; Einolf, 2011; Taniguchi, 2006).

## VIII. Collaborative Philanthropy and New Forms of Giving

In the past decade, collaborative forms of giving have continued to increase, making philanthropy more democratic, participatory, and engaging for individual donors. Organized collaborative giving has existed for more than 100 years in the form of the community foundation, and later, the United Way and Combined Federal Campaign; informal examples of collaborative giving can be traced throughout U.S. history. In recent years, new forms of giving, including giving circles, event-based crowdfunding, and online crowdfunding have emerged and have been particularly attractive to women and other donors. While little systematic study of gender has been applied to these forms of giving, qualitative research shows that women respond positively to collaborative giving and may see it as way “to be social ‘while doing good’” (Eikenberry, 2006, p. 527).

Much of this “new” philanthropy has taken place in giving circles, groups where individuals pool their money and other resources (i.e., time) and then decide together on the beneficiaries of such resources (Eikenberry, 2006). In addition to serving a philanthropic role, giving circles also educate members about community issues, engage members in voluntary efforts, and provide social opportunities, networking, and personal empowerment (Eikenberry, 2006; Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). Most U.S. giving circles maintain independence from any particular charity, though some are hosted by community foundations and others are formal groups of specific nonprofit organizations. In contrast, giving circles in the U.K. are more likely to be connected to a larger network with professional staff or have administrative support. Giving circles appear to be increasing in number, with studies documenting at least 225 giving circles in 2005, growing to more than 500 today which distribute more than \$200 million annually (Eikenberry, 2006; Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). Over half of the giving circles in the U.S. have been identified as women-only groups (Bearman, 2007).

Focusing on their organizational structure, Eikenberry (2006; 2009) categorized U.S. giving circles into three major types: small groups, loose networks, and formal organizations. Small groups typically involve members contributing equal amounts (anywhere from \$50 to \$5,000) and full participation by members in leadership and decision making. Loose networks have a core group of people who oversee the group while other members typically gather around a specific event or fundraiser. Finally, formal organizations have the most defined structure and decision-making processes and look like traditional membership organizations. These can include social venture funds, young leader funds, affiliated funds, and independent 501(c)(3) organizations. Caster (2008) documents one such women's giving circle, the Everychild Foundation, established in Los Angeles in 1999, which has 225 members and had made over \$5 million in grants to benefit local youth. Regardless of their structure, most U.S. giving circles are volunteer-driven and volunteer-led (Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014).

Giving circles have been particularly attractive to women and younger participants who are often new to philanthropy or who are looking to increase their level of giving and civic engagement. In a 2007 study, 81 percent of giving circle participants were women and just over half of all giving circles were comprised entirely of women (Bearman, 2007). As giving circles tend to focus on local needs, by leveraging the funds of the group, individual donors can have a greater impact as a giving circle than they can have alone. Giving circles can also be seen as place where individual women donors are empowered through group processes and decision

making (Caster, 2008; Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). In these settings, participants can learn about community issues, nonprofit organizations, and the grantmaking process, and be active participants in reviewing grants and making site visits. Giving circles may serve as sites for women who are not in the labor force to begin transitioning back to paid work (Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). Some giving circles incorporate volunteer engagement in addition to giving money, while others see giving money as an alternative to volunteering, thus limiting members' time commitment (Eikenberry, 2006). In short, women seem to appreciate that they can select their desired range of philanthropic involvement (Caster, 2008). Giving circle members also tend to be overwhelmingly White and from professional and upper-middle-class backgrounds; individual circles are usually quite homogenous (Eikenberry, 2006). Some giving circles may also be exclusive to a particular race/ethnicity or other identity-based characteristic (Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). Examples include the African American Women's Giving Circle, a program of the Washington Area Women's Foundation in Washington, DC; the Asian Women's Giving Circle, a donor-advised fund of the Ms. Foundation; a plethora of Jewish women's funds and giving circles; Women of Vision, a program of the international humanitarian agency World Vision; Hmong Women Giving Circle in Minnesota; Muslim Women's Giving Circle in San Francisco; and groups such as Young Women Philanthropists of Greater Memphis. Such homogeneity may enable a group's collective decision making, but can limit the group's overall diversity (Rose, 1994).

In addition to cultivating new donors, many giving circles are also focused on leveraging and expanding giving, particularly for women's issues (Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). Small groups and formal organizations also seem to give a larger percentage of their funding to women and girls and children and youth, filling gaps that are not already being met by other donors or established foundations (Caster, 2008; Eikenberry, 2006; Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). Nearly half of the giving circles surveyed by the Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers reported that women and girls were a funding priority (Bearman, 2007). Eikenberry (2006) explains this as members making funding decisions that are similar or reflective of their own membership; therefore, an all-female giving circle may be more likely to give to a women's organization.

Giving circles also serve as a path to developing women as leaders (Bearman, 2007; Eikenberry, 2006). Unlike women's voluntary work as fundraisers for nonprofit organizations, commonly in the form of event planning, giving circles can offer members more meaningful work often in a democratically-run organization (Caster, 2008). As most giving circles are member-driven, many choose to have a committee structure with a chair or leader at the helm (Eikenberry & Breeze, 2014). In a case study of a women's giving circle, members reported feeling a "sense of ownership" in the organization and said their participation encouraged them to expand their individual philanthropic work as well (Caster, 2008). Giving circles also prioritize member equality through equal monetary giving, equal voting on funding decisions, and cycling on and off various committees, which can make a leadership role seem less intimidating due to the absence of an entrenched hierarchy (Caster, 2008; Eikenberry, 2006).

In addition to giving circles, women's charitable foundations and funds serve as another opportunity for women to give collectively and to challenge the traditional image of women volunteers as "Lady Bountiful" (Brilliant, 2000; Ostrander, 2004; Rose, 1994). While discussed in more detail below, as they specifically target their funding toward women's and girls' issues,

they are an example of formal organizations where individual donors combine their funding. Women's funds are not only examples of places for women to give collaboratively, but also promote women's leadership, as all the chief officers and board members are women, and often aim to make philanthropy more egalitarian through the involvement of grantees on grant committees (Ostrander, 2004; Rose, 1994). While women's funds also often maintain democratic and participatory ideals, unlike giving circles, most women's funds/foundations either have a staff or volunteer grants committee that makes giving decisions instead of the individual donors themselves (Ostrander, 2004; Rose, 1994).

In recent years, new forms of giving have emerged, from giving circles going online, to social impact investing, microfinance, and crowdfunding. Several of these new models bypass formal organizations to give directly to individuals in need, particularly in international contexts (e.g., Kiva, Give Directly). Academic literature is only beginning to explore these new giving mechanisms, including the role of gender and women's participation. Understanding who these donors are and their motivations is a key area for future study.

## **IX. Philanthropy for Women's and Girls' Issues**

To date, no known surveys of philanthropic behavior have specifically categorized giving to women and girls. Large-scale surveys such as the Philanthropy Panel Study, conducted by the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, do not provide a specific category for giving to women and girls. Instead, the PPS asks respondents to group their giving into one of eleven broad categories, including: religious purposes; combination organizations (e.g., United Way, community foundations); human services; health; education; youth and family; arts and culture; community organizations and service clubs; environment and animals; international; and other. Clearly, these categories include organizations that serve women and girls, whether primarily or exclusively, but it is impossible to separate out such giving. Instead, scholars who are interested in social movements and women's empowerment have paid greater attention to social movement-specific funding, which aims to direct funds toward women and girls.

While little is known about giving to this issue area by individual donors, studies of foundation funding show that only a small percentage of all giving benefits women and girls. Ostrander (2004) reports that, "Organizations run by and for women and girls receive only 6 percent of total monies given by charitable foundations in the United States" (p. 33); Capek and Mead (2005) estimate that about 7 percent of U.S. foundation funding goes to programs that focus on women and girls. Capek and Mead (2005) argue that a "nuanced understanding of diversity that includes gender and gendered cultural competence is a key variable for doing effective philanthropy" (p. 6). In a study by the Foundation Center, Shah, McGill, and Weisblatt (2011) show that European foundations devote a median of 4.8 percent of their funding to women and girls. At least one-third of European foundations indicated that they engaged in some grantmaking or programmatic activities that benefit women and girls, and many more expressed interest in specific issue areas that affect this population (e.g., violence, poverty, health) (Shah et al., 2011).

In the 1980s, a number of women-specific social change funds were established that aimed to decrease the gender gap in philanthropic funding (Brilliant, 2000; Feminist Majority Foundation, 1991; Ostrander, 2004; Rose, 1994). The Women's Funding Network (WFN), originally named the National Network of Women's Funds, formed in 1985 to serve as "an umbrella organization for an identified women's funding movement" (Brilliant, 2000, p. 555), and provides advocacy, training, technical assistance, and visibility as well as an annual conference for its member funds (Brilliant, 2000; Rose, 1994). A women's fund is also different from other foundations: "Women raise the dollars and decide how they're spent; grants and allocations support programs that assist women and girls in overcoming racial, economic, political, sexual, and social discrimination" (National Network of Women's Funds as cited in Rose, 1994, p. 230). In many ways, women's funds are one branch of a "social movement industry" and alternative funding movement that includes Asian American funds, Latino funds, African American funds, gay and lesbian funds, and even environmental funds. They were established in response to the dissatisfaction of women working in more mainstream philanthropic institutions, including the lack of philanthropic dollars directed toward women's and girls' organizations and programs (Brilliant, 2000; Rose, 1994). These funds are also likely to be headed by women, have a majority of women on their board of directors, and have an expressed commitment to diversity (Rose, 1994). Today, the WFN includes over 160 women's funds in 27 countries on six



continents that “define fund-raising and fund allocation as a strategy for empowering women and achieving social change” (Brilliant, 2000, p. 554; WFN, 2013).

Little research has taken place on women’s funds since 2000, and the existing research has focused more on organizational development and culture, external factors, and social movement theory than the motivations and behaviors of individual donors to these funds. Specially, Rose (1994) argues that women’s funds offer an example of alternatives to traditional bureaucratic structures. Yet as formalized social movement organizations that emerged out of the grassroots women’s movement, research also has documented that women’s funds face contemporary challenges of maintaining movement passion and participatory goals as organizations professionalize and become institutionalized within the wider philanthropic landscape (Brilliant, 2000; Rose, 1994). Individual funds are also quite diverse and historical records have not been well-maintained. Despite their feminist heritage, individual member funds represent a variety of ideological viewpoints, though all share a common goal of enhancing philanthropic resources for women and girls. Member funds may be local, statewide, national, or even global, such as the Global Fund for Women, or focused on a special purpose, such as the Astraea National Lesbian Action Foundation. Some funds are independent, while others exist within community foundations; similarly, funds may be public charities, which raise funds from broader constituencies versus private foundations, often established by a single major donor. Funds range in endowment size, annual fundraising, and annual grantmaking. Finally, documenting annual data on the fundraising and assets of individual funds has been inconsistent, making the growth of these funds over time difficult to calculate. In 2000, WFN estimated that its member funds held assets of over \$200 million, and that they distributed \$30 million in annual grantmaking (WFN, 2014). In 2006, individual donors Swanee Hunt and Helen LaKelly Hunt made a gift to initiate a campaign to raise gifts of \$1 million or more for women’s funds. This initiative became Women Moving Millions, which had raised a total of \$182 million by the end of 2009 (WFN, 2014).

Women’s and feminist programs and organizations are also supported by individual women far more than male donors. These can include national women’s rights organizations; professional women’s groups and caucuses; women’s labor groups; organizations serving women of color; women’s studies programs and centers; feminist publications and media; global women’s groups; and women’s services such as rape crises centers, battered women’s shelters, family planning clinics, and women’s legal defense funds. Other nonprofits that support feminist issues include those focusing on child care, women of color, disabled women, economic equity, family planning, lesbian rights, violence against women, women’s health, and young women, among others. The Feminist Majority Foundation (1991) reported that over 85 percent of the National Organization for Women’s and the Fund for the Feminist Majority’s donors are women, and over 60 percent of direct mail gifts to women’s organizations come from women.

## X. Conclusions and Opportunities for Future Research

Women play a distinct and powerful role in philanthropy as both donors and recipients. As the review of research shows, questions about gender differences and about women's roles are emerging more quickly than they are being answered. How have women's changing economic and social status resulted in changes to their philanthropic behavior, including issues and concerns? Are women realizing greater control over their philanthropic decision making, as suggested by their educational and economic gains? How does giving change over a woman's life course? How do women-created and women-run organizations differ in the ways they address today's pressing issues, and what is their impact?

Our review of the literature provides an opportunity to develop a coherent research agenda to address questions about gender through a comprehensive methodological approach. While some questions about gender and philanthropy have been explored in depth, a number of potential unexplored avenues and findings are far from being settled. Further, women's social and economic positions will continue to change in the coming decades, with increases in women's business ownership, earned income, political participation, and decision making in both household and public spheres (Glynn, 2014; Verveer, 2011). These trends may have a powerful impact on philanthropy. While exact figures are difficult to pin down, media reports estimate that women control up to 60 percent of wealth in the U.S. (\$10 trillion-\$12 trillion in 2008), which is projected to grow to up to \$22 trillion by 2020 (Gunelius, 2010). If women were to unleash just one percent of their growing wealth for charitable contributions, they could significantly grow philanthropy in the U.S., adding approximately \$220 billion. When coupled with the anticipated trillions of dollars anticipated in the inter-generational wealth transfers of the coming decades, women may have access to previously unimaginable resources for the common good (Havens & Schervish, 2003). Understanding how changes in women's wealth will unfold over the next generations will play a pivotal role in increasing women's potential to give and the ways in which they give.

This research summary has shown that findings on gender motivations for giving, such as women's higher altruism, empathy, and prosocial motivations, are fairly well-established. In other areas of interest, such as giving to women and girls and the power of women in crowdfunding, there are significant gaps. Case studies have been compiled, but survey data have not been collected. Still, other questions have been explored but are not at all settled; for example, women are said to "spread out their wealth" more than men, giving smaller amounts to more charitable subsectors. However, all findings do not align, in part due to the methodological approach and to the different categories and definitions used on surveys. Research questions like this should be explored in more depth to understand the nuances of the findings and provide more explanation for results. With this view in mind, we propose the following priorities for future research on women's philanthropy:

***Women have a substantial history as philanthropic donors and leaders.*** From the establishment of New York's Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children in 1797 to the creation of the Ms. Foundation in 1972, women have used voluntary organizations to address important issues in their communities, sometimes to benefit themselves but often for the good of others. Building on women's historical leadership, new research on women donors

and how they are socialized will yield information about how society and women interact, prompting women to give differently than men. For example, existing studies have shown that adding women to a group of donors changes the behavior of the entire group. As women's wealth increases and as women continue to act more entrepreneurial in their giving behavior, future research should address whether these changes have an impact on giving by women, and also by the men with whom they interact. Potential research topics include:

- *Networking and relationships.* Women have been widely found to have larger social networks than men. With the rise of technology as a factor in relationships, including social media, research should explore how women influence others through these channels and how women's giving and volunteering behavior is influenced by this activity.
- *The role of language in gender and giving.* The language donors use to describe themselves, as well as the language institutions use to describe their donors, differs by gender. Research should address how the language differs, whether interventions can produce a change in this language, and whether changing language impacts giving.
- *The impact of women's philanthropic leadership.* Women-created and women-run organizations have been documented but insufficiently studied to understand their potential for cultivating new leaders. Further, with women's increased wealth, more women than ever before are making multi-million-dollar gifts and establishing their own foundations. Research should investigate how these leadership transformations affect women's motivations and impact on giving.

***Women have significant and increasing influence in American society.*** Over the past 40 years, women have made notable gains in educational attainment and personal income and wealth, both of which are strong predictors of giving and also influence volunteering. These changes in demographics suggest that women have gained and will likely continue to gain additional resources for philanthropic giving. Understanding key differences between men's and women's giving provides important insights on how women may influence and perhaps even transform philanthropy in the future. Research on this subject could investigate:

- *Central research questions with mixed or tenuous results.* Research questions that have been studied but not answered conclusively warrant additional investigation. One example of such a question is whether women do indeed spread out their wealth in giving, and if so, why. This approach may be best accomplished by coordinating a group of investigations together, exploring one question with multiple methodologies, for example, using data from surveys and using experimental designs.
- *Giving over the life course.* This topic has been explored but not to the extent possible. Data for the Philanthropy Panel Study have been collected for more than a decade; these data have provided a wealth of knowledge about U.S. household giving. However, more data (and therefore, more time) are necessary to truly explore how giving changes over the course of one's lifetime. A number of changes take place during one's life that affect giving, including marriage, children, and other family changes, as well as economic or health shocks to the household. Studies on shorter time periods have shown that these changes affect women differently than men, but exploring these questions over the entire life cycle would yield new and vital information.

- *Gender differences in bequest giving.* Research on bequest giving has often centered on tax implications; few studies have looked at how men and women make bequests and donors' underlying motivations. As women both participate in and benefit from inter-generational wealth transfers in coming decades, bequest giving offers women a significant opportunity to grow their philanthropy.

***Women are carving out new approaches to philanthropy.*** Within existing research on women's philanthropic activity, least understood is how gender as a category of analysis, along with race, class, and religion, shapes women's philanthropic priorities and philanthropic behaviors. Beyond simply having increased resources to direct toward philanthropic causes, women participate in philanthropy differently than men because of their economic and social roles. Historically, many women's organizations relied heavily on volunteers, since they had less access to capital and often relied on a broad base of small donations. Today, women are participating in new models of giving such as women's funds and giving circles, in which they create and fund the organizations and disburse the funds. Subjects for further exploration may include:

- *Evaluating philanthropy.* We know that women give differently than men in many ways, but research has not extended this exploration to the topic of how donors evaluate their philanthropy. Women may seek different outcomes in their giving or have different criteria for evaluating the impact of their philanthropy.
- *Donor education.* While we know that educating donors can transform their philanthropy, research has not yet been conducted to examine how men and women may benefit differently from such education. Field experiments would provide an ideal way to understand how educating donors, especially women donors, impacts their giving. For example, if women do indeed spread out their wealth largely because they do not have a strategy associated with their giving, or because they are less likely than men to refuse a request for a donation, then educating women donors about a giving strategy may lead them to give differently.
- *Giving circles.* Similar to donor education, does participating in giving in a group setting change or increase women's philanthropy? While existing research documents women's affinity for giving circles, understanding their long-term impact has not been studied.
- *Impact investing.* Finally, how do men's and women's attitudes toward impact investing differ? This model of giving may present both limitations and opportunities to women donors. Research should explore how women learn about impact investing, and how their philanthropic behavior changes as a result.

***Philanthropy to women and girls is growing and has transformational potential.***

While giving circles promote a democratization of philanthropy, the initiative Women Moving Millions, established by Helen LaKelly Hunt and Ambassador Swanee Hunt, encourages female donors to make gifts of \$1 million or more for programs benefiting women and girls. Recognizing that all levels of donors support women's and girls' issues, research can help us understand what difference this targeted philanthropy makes. Research on this topic should address:

- *Measuring giving to women and girls.* Currently, estimating the total dollars going to women's and girls' causes is not possible with existing data sources. Encouraging

subsequent surveys to include this as a category means that we can start to understand if individual donors give the same proportions as foundations. Knowing more about what motivates donors to give to this issue area would provide information for organizations and fundraisers; a potential project would compare the motivations and giving behaviors of those who give specifically to this issue area as compared to those who do not.

- *Anticipating the future of giving to women and girls.* Not only should we explore giving to this issue area in the present day, but we should explore how this giving will transform society. Literature on international development has found that funding for women and girls has significant positive impacts on their families and society as a whole (Chaaban & Cunningham, 2011; Summers, Khan, & Sabot, 1992), but can sometimes produce unintended consequences as women's status changes (Dunn & Arbuckle, 2001; Kantor, 2000). Philanthropic literature has not explored giving to women and girls to the same extent. How will giving to women and girls impact not just the female beneficiaries of such philanthropy but all of society? How will this funding grow and change over time, and how will funders measure success?

While the four points above hold the most potential for sector-wide impact through future research, several other topics would also be interesting to explore. One example is research on solicitation and fundraising appeals, which has generally not been explored by gender. For example, do women respond differently than men to certain methods of donor solicitation? Secondly, does the donor recognition mechanism vary by gender? Another example is that policy implications should be explored as an aspect of each research topic detailed above. Tax and other incentives are likely to influence women differently than men. If they do, research should identify possible incentives that may appeal more to women donors to guide public policies designed to increase philanthropic support. Research also needs to attend to theory building that crosses disciplinary boundaries and can account for the multiple mechanisms at play that influence donors to give (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a).

This literature review demonstrates that while much is already known about women's giving, some findings are inconclusive, and many questions remain unexplored entirely. While existing research has focused on gender as a control variable in giving, future research should explore how gender and generosity interact in all aspects of social life. The research agenda suggested above is preliminary and open to discussion with other scholars and researchers, as well as foundations and women's organizations that may be interested in these lines of inquiry. Addressing the questions above will provide insight into how giving will change in future decades, and the role women will play in these trends.

## References

- Abzug, R., DiMaggio, P. J., Gray, B. H., Kang, C. H., & Useem, M. (1993). Variations in trusteeship: Cases from Boston and Cleveland, 1925-1985. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 4, 271-300.
- Andreoni, J., Brown, E., & Rischall, I. (2003). Charitable giving by married couples: Who decides and why does it matter? *Journal of Human Resources*, 38(1), 111-133.
- Andreoni, J., Harbaugh, W. T., & Vesterlund, L. (2008). Altruism in experiments. In S. N. Durlauf & L. E. Blume (Eds.), *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andreoni, J., & Payne, A. A. (2013). Charitable giving. In A. J. Auerbach, R. Chetty, M. Feldstein, & E. Saez (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Economics* (pp. 1-50). Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Andreoni, J., & Vesterlund, L. (2001). Which is the fair sex? Gender differences in altruism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1), 293-312.
- Atkinson, A. B., Backus, P. G., & Micklewright, J. (2009). Charitable bequests and wealth at death in Great Britain. Working Paper A09/03, Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute, University of Southampton.
- Bearman, J. E. (2007). *More giving together: The growth and impact of giving circles and shared giving*. Washington, DC: Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers.
- Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and health related philanthropy: The role of resources and personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(4), 349-366.
- Bekkers, R. (2007). Measuring altruistic behavior in surveys: The all-or-nothing dictator game. *Survey Research Methods*, 1(3), 139-144.
- Bekkers, R. (2010). George gives to geology Jane: The name letter effect and incidental similarity cues in fundraising. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15(2), 172-180.
- Bekkers, R. & Schuyt, T. (2008). And who is your neighbor? Explaining denominational differences in charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 50(1), 74-96.
- Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2006). To give or not to give, that's the question: How methodology is destiny in Dutch giving data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3), 533-540.

Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2011a). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973.

Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011b). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving, part 1: Religion, education, age and socialization. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365.

Belfield, C. R., & Beney, A. P. (2000). What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*, 8(1), 65-80.

Ben-Ner, A., Kong, F., & Putterman, L. (2004). Share and share alike? Gender-pairing, personality, and cognitive ability as determinants of giving. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 25(5), 581-589.

Beutel, A. M., & Marini, M. M. (1995). Gender and values. *American Sociological Review*, 436-448.

Block, J. H. (1976). Assessing sex differences: Issues, problems, and pitfalls. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 22, 283-308.

Bolton, G. E., & Katok, E. (1995). An experimental test for gender differences in beneficent behavior. *Economics Letters*, 48(3), 287-292.

Brilliant, E. L. (2000). Women's gain: Fund-raising and fund allocation as an evolving social movement strategy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29, 554-570.

Brooks, A. C. (2007). Income tax policy and charitable giving. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26(3), 599-612.

Brown, E. (2005). Married couples' charitable giving: Who and why. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 2005(50), 69-80.

Brown, E., & Ferris, J. M. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: An analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 85-99.

Brown, E., & Lankford, H. (1992). Gifts of money and gifts of time: Estimating the effects of tax prices and available time. *Journal of Public Economics*, 47(3), 321-341.

Brown, E., Mesch, D. J., & Hayat, A. D. (2014). Who's stingy? Life expectancy and the search for a bag lady effect. Unpublished manuscript.

Brown-Kruse, J., & Hummels, D. (1993). Gender effects in laboratory public goods contribution: Do individuals put their money where their mouth is? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 22(3), 255-267.

Brunel, F. F., & Nelson, M. R. (2000). Explaining gendered responses to “help-self” and “help-others” charity advertising appeals: The mediating role of world-views. *Journal of Advertising*, 29(3), 15-29.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011). Spotlight: Women at Work. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2011/women/>.

Burgoyne, C. B., Young, B., & Walker, C. M. (2005). Deciding to give to charity: A focus group study in the context of the household economy. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 15(5), 383-405.

Burns, D. J., Reid, J., Toncar, M., Anderson, C., & Wells, C. (2008). The effect of gender on the motivation of members of generation Y college students to volunteer. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 19(1), 99-118.

Cadsby, C. B., Servátka, M., & Song, F. (2010). Gender and generosity: does degree of anonymity or group gender composition matter? *Experimental Economics*, 13(3), 299-308.

Capek, M. E. S., & Mead, M. (2007). *Effective philanthropy: Organizational success through deep diversity and gender equality*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Carlin, P. S. (2001). Evidence on the volunteer labor supply of married women. *Southern Economic Journal*, 801-824.

Caster, J. J. (2008). A new direction in women’s philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37, 353-361.

Caucutt, E. M., Guner, N., & Knowles, J. (2002). Why do women wait? Matching, wage inequality, and the incentives for fertility delay. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 5(4), 815-855.

Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (COP). (2011a). *Review of literature on giving and high net worth individuals*. Indianapolis: Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.

Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (COP). (2011b). *The 2011 study of high net worth women’s philanthropy and the impact of women’s giving networks*. Indianapolis: Bank of America Corporation.

Chaaban, J., & Cunningham, W. (2011). Measuring the economic gain of investing in girls: The girl effect dividend. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series.



- Chambré, S. M. (1993). Parallel power structures, invisible careers, benevolence, and reform: Implications of women's philanthropy. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 4, 233-40.
- Chang, W.-C. (2005). Religious giving, non-religious giving, and after-life consumption. *Topics in Economic Analysis and Policy*, 5(1), article 13.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1516-1530.
- Cox, J. C., & Deck, C. A. (2006). When are women more generous than men? *Economic Inquiry*, 44(4), 587-598.
- Creswell, J. W. (Ed.). (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Croson, R., & Gneezy, U. (2009). Gender differences in preferences. *Journal of Economic literature*, 448-474.
- Croson, R. T., Handy, F., & Shang, J. (2010). Gendered giving: the influence of social norms on the donation behavior of men and women. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15(2), 199-213.
- Daniels, A. K. (1985). Good times and good works: The place of sociability in the work of women volunteers. *Social Problems*, 32(4), 363-374
- Dawson, N., Grattan, S., Lundy, L., Glenn, R., & Cran, G. (2003). *Dying to give? Trends in charitable giving by will*. London: The Stationary Office.
- DellaVigna, S., List, J. A., Malmendier, U., & Rao, G. (2013). *The importance of being marginal: Gender differences in generosity* (No. w18748). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Dufwenberg, M., & Muren, A. (2006). Generosity, anonymity, gender. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 61(1), 42-49.
- Dunn, E., & Arbuckle, J. G. (2001). Microcredit and microenterprise performance: impact evidence from Peru. *Small Enterprise Development*, 12(4), 22-33.
- Eagly, A. H. (2009). The his and hers of prosocial behavior: An examination of the social psychology of gender. *American Psychologist*, 64(8), 644.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 283.

- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1998). Are women less selfish than men? Evidence from dictator experiments. *The Economic Journal*, 108(448), 726-735.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2001). Chivalry and solidarity in ultimatum games. *Economic Inquiry*, 39(2), 171-188.
- Eckel, C. C., Grossman, P. J., & Johnston, R. M. (2005). An experimental test of the crowding out hypothesis. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89(8), 1543-1560.
- Eikenberry, A. M. (2006). Giving circles: Growing grassroots philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3), 517-532.
- Eikenberry, A. M. (2009). *Giving circles: Philanthropy, voluntary association, and democracy*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Eikenberry, A. M., & Breeze, B. (2014). *The Landscape of Giving Circles in the United Kingdom and Ireland*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Einolf, C. J. (2011). Gender differences in the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 1092-1112.
- Einolf, C. J., & Philbrick, D. (2014). Generous or greedy marriage? A longitudinal study of volunteering and charitable giving. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(3), 573-586.
- Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(1), 100.
- Eller, M. B. (2001). Charitable bequests: Evidence from federal estate tax returns. *Statistics of Income (SOI) Bulletin, Publication 1136 (Revised 5-01)*, 174-190.
- Feminist Majority Foundation. (1991). *Empowering women in philanthropy*. The empowering women series, no. 3. Arlington, VA: Feminist Majority Foundation.
- Fletcher, T. D., & Major, D. A. (2004). Medical students' motivations to volunteer: An examination of the nature of gender differences. *Sex Roles*, 51(1-2), 109-114.
- Forbes, K. F., & Zampelli, E. M. (2014). Volunteerism: The influences of social, religious, and human capital. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2), 227-253.
- Friedberg, L., & Webb, A. (2006). Determinants and consequences of bargaining power in households (No. w12367). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Glynn, S. J. (2014). *Breadwinning mothers, then and now*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Goldin, C., & Katz, L. F. (2000). The power of the pill: Oral contraceptives and women's career and marriage decisions (No. w7527). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Greer, J. (2000). Women supporting women supporting women: A full circle of empowerment. *Fund Raising Management*, 31(1), 36–37.

Gunelius, S. (2010). *Women making economic strides and not slowing down*. Forbes. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-progress/2010/07/28/women-making-economic-strides-and-not-slowing-down/>.

Guth, W., Schmidt, C., & Sutter, M. (2007). Bargaining outside the lab: A newspaper experiment of a three-person ultimatum game. *Economic Journal*, 117(518), 449-469.

Harvey, J. (1990). Benefit segmentation for fundraisers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18(1), 77–86.

Havens, J. J., & Schervish, P. G. (2003). Why the \$41 trillion wealth transfer estimate is still valid: A review of challenges and questions. *The Journal of Gift Planning*, 7(1), 11-15, 47-50.

Heller, L. R., & Badding, K. D. (2012). For compassion or money? The factors influencing the funding of micro loans. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 41(6), 831-835.

Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(4), 712.

Hughes, P., & Luksetich, W. (2008). Income volatility and wealth: The effect on charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37(2), 264-280.

Israel, D. K. (2007). Charitable donations: Evidence of demand for environmental protection? *International Advances in Economic Research*, 13(2), 171-182.

Jackson, J. M., & Latané, B. (1981). Strength and number of solicitors and the urge toward altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7(3), 415-422.

Jones, A., & Posnett, J. (1991). Charitable donations by UK households: Evidence from the Family Expenditure Survey. *Applied Economics*, 23(2), 183-198.

Kamas, L., Preston, A., & Baum, S. (2008). Altruism in individual and joint-giving decisions: What's gender got to do with it? *Feminist Economics*, 14(3), 23-50.

Kantor, P. (2000). Are economic outcomes enough? Incorporating empowerment outcomes into a definition of microenterprise success: Evidence from India. *Manuscript, University of Madison-Wisconsin*.

- Keyt, J. C., Yavas, U., & Riecken, G. (2002). Comparing donor segments to a cause-based charity: the case of the American Lung Association. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 10(2), 117-134.
- Kottasz, R. (2004). Differences in the donor behavior characteristics of young affluent males and females: Empirical evidence from Britain. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 15(2), 181-203.
- Kou, X., Hayat, A. D., Mesch, D. J., & Osili, U. O. (2013). The global dynamics of gender and philanthropy in membership associations: A study of charitable giving by Lions Clubs International members. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764013502583.
- Laughlin, G. (2014). *Male teachers get more donations than female teachers. Why?* DonorsChoose.org Data Blog. Retrieved from <http://data.donorschoose.org/male-teachers-get-donations-female-teachers/>.
- Leslie, L. M., Snyder, M., & Glomb, T. M. (2013). Who gives? Multilevel effects of gender and ethnicity on workplace charitable giving. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 49.
- List, J. A. (2004). Young, selfish and male: Field evidence of social preferences. *The Economic Journal*, 114(492), 121-149.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (Eds.). (1974). *The psychology of sex differences* (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press.
- Marx, J. D. (2000). Women and human services giving. *Social Work*, 45(1), 27-38.
- Masthoff, J., Langrial, S., & van Deemter, K. (2013). Personalizing triggers for charity actions. In *Persuasive Technology* (pp. 125-136). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- McCarthy, K. D. (1990). Parallel power structures: Women and the voluntary sphere. In K. D. McCarthy (Ed.), *Lady bountiful revisited: Women, philanthropy and power* (pp. 1-31). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- McCarthy, K. D. (Ed.). (2001). *Women, philanthropy, and civil society* (Vol. 18). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- McCarthy, K. D. (2003). *American creed: Philanthropy and the rise of civil society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Meier, S. (2007). Do women behave less or more prosocially than men? Evidence from two field experiments. *Public Finance Review*, 35(2), 215-232.

Mesch, D. J. (2010). *Women give 2010: New research about women and giving*. Indianapolis, IN: Women's Philanthropy Institute, Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.

Mesch, D. J., Brown, M. S., Moore, Z. I., & Hayat, A. D. (2011). Gender differences in charitable giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4), 342-355.

Mesch, D., Moore, Z., & Ottoni-Wilhelm, M. (2010). Does Jewish Philanthropy Differ by Sex and Type of Giving? *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues*, 20, 80-96.

Mesch, D. J., Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. S. & Denton, B. (2006). The effects of race, gender and marital status on giving and volunteering in Indiana. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(4), 565-587.

Meslin, E. M., Rooney, P. M., & Wolf, J. G. (2008). Health-related philanthropy: Toward understanding the relationship between the donation of the body (and its parts) and traditional forms of philanthropic giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37, 44S-62S.

Micklewright, J., & Schnepf, S. V. (2009). Who gives charitable donations for overseas development? *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(2), 317-341.

Midlarsky, E., & Hannah, M. E. (1989). The generous elderly: Naturalistic studies of donations across the life span. *Psychology and Ageing*, 4(3), 346-351.

Miller, A. S., & Hofman, J. P. (1995). Risk and religion: An explanation of gender differences in religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 34(1), 63-75.

Mills, R. S., Pedersen, J., & Grusec, J. E. (1989). Sex differences in reasoning and emotion about altruism. *Sex Roles*, 20(11-12), 603-621.

Monk-Turner, E., Blake, V., Chniel, F., Forbes, S., Lensey, L., & Madzuma, J. (2002). Helping hands: A study of altruistic behavior. *Gender Issues*, 20(4), 65-70.

Nank, R. (2011). Women and the nonprofit sector. In M. J. D'Agostino & H. Levine (Eds.), *Women in public administration: Theory and practice* (pp. 285-296). Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Nesbit, R. (2010). A comparison of volunteering data in the panel study of income dynamics and the current population survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(4), 753-761.

Nowell, C., & Tinkler, S. (1994). The influence of gender on the provision of a public good. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 25(1), 25-36.

Odendahl, T. (1996). Women's power, nonprofits and the future. In T. Odendahl & M. Fischer, *Gender and the professionalization of philanthropy, Essays on Philanthropy, No. 19*. (pp. 3-11). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.

Okunade, A. A. (1996). Graduate school alumni donations to academic funds: micro-data evidence. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 55(2), 213-229.

Osili, U., Miller, J. E., & Mesch, D. (n.d.). Evidence from the COPPS 2007 Wave. Unpublished manuscript.

Ostrander, S. A. (2004). Moderating contradictions of feminist philanthropy: Women's community organizations and the Boston Women's Fund, 1995 to 2000. *Gender & Society*, 18(1), 29-46.

Pahl, J. (1995). His money, her money: Recent research on financial organization in marriage. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 16, 361-376.

Piper, G., & Schnepf, S. V. (2008). Gender differences in charitable giving in Great Britain. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19(2), 103-124.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.

Rose, M. S. (1994). Philanthropy in a different voice: The women's funds. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23:227-242.

Rooney, P., Brown, E., & Mesch, D. (2007). Who decides in giving to education? A study of charitable giving by married couples. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(3), 229-242.

Rooney, P. M., Mesch, D. J., Chin, W., & Steinberg, K. S. (2005). The effects of race, gender, and survey methodologies on giving in the US. *Economics Letters*, 86(2), 173-180.

Sargeant, A., Wymer, W., & Hilton, T. (2006). Marketing bequest club membership: an exploratory study of legacy pledgers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3), 384-404.

Scott, A. F. (1984). On seeing and not seeing: A case of historical invisibility. *The Journal of American History*, 7-21.

Scott, A. F. (1990). Most invisible of all: Black women's voluntary associations. *The Journal of Southern History*, 3-22.

Shah, S., McGill, L. T., & Weisblatt, K. (2011). Untapped potential: European foundation funding for women and girls. Washington, D.C.: The Foundation Center. Retrieved from [http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/untapped\\_potential.pdf](http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/untapped_potential.pdf).

Shapiro, S. L., & Ridinger, L. L. (2011). An analysis of donor involvement, gender, and giving in college athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 20(1).

Simmons, W. O., & Emanuele, R. (2007). Male-female giving differentials: are women more altruistic? *Journal of Economic Studies*, 34(6), 534-550.

Sokolowski, S. W. (1996). Show me the way to the next worthy deed: Towards a microstructural theory of volunteering and giving. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 7(3), 259-278.

Steinberg, R. J., & Jacobs, J. A. (1994). Pay equity in nonprofit organizations: Making women's work visible. In T. Odendahl, M. O'Neill (Eds.), *Women and power in the nonprofit sector*, (pp. 79-120). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Summers, L.H., Khan, M.A., and Sabot, R.H. (1992). Investing in all the people. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 31(4), 367-404.

Taniguchi, H. (2006). Men's and women's volunteering: Gender differences in the effects of employment and family characteristics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(1), 83-101.

Themudo, N. S. (2009). Gender and the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(4), 663-603.

Toppe, C. M. (2002). *Giving & volunteering in the United States, 2001: Findings from a national survey*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

United Nations. (2015). United Nations Millennium Development Goals: Promote gender equality and empower women. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/gender.shtml>.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/>.

Verveer, M. (2011). *The political and economic power of women*. Washington, DC: Center for International Private Enterprise.

Visser, M. S., & Roelofs, M. R. (2011). Heterogeneous preferences for altruism: gender and personality, social status, giving and taking. *Experimental Economics*, 14(4), 490-506.

Wang, L., & Graddy, E. (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19(1), 23-42.

Wang, W., & Parker, K. (2014). Record share of Americans have never married. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/09/24/record-share-of-americans-have-never-married/>.

Weyant, J. M. (1984). Applying social psychology to induce charitable donations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 14(5), 441-447.

Wiepking, P., & Bekkers, R. (2010). Does who decides really matter? Causes and consequences of personal financial management in the case of larger and structural charitable donations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 21(2), 240-263.

Wiepking, P., & Bekkers, R. (2012). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part two: Gender, family composition and income. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(2), 217-245.

Wiepking, P., & Einolf, C. J. (2012). The gendered pathways of prosocial behavior. Unpublished manuscript prepared for ARNOVA 2012 conference.

Wiepking, P., & Maas, I. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 87(4), 1973-1995.

Wilhelm, M. O. (2006). New data on charitable giving in the PSID. *Economics Letters*, 92(1), 26-31.

Wilhelm, M. O. (2007). The quality and comparability of survey data on charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 65-84.

Willer, R., Wimer, C., & Owens, L. A. (2015). What drives the gender gap in charitable giving? Lower empathy leads men to give less to poverty relief. *Social Science Research*.

Winterich, K. P., Mittal, V., & Ross Jr, W. T. (2009). Donation behavior toward in-groups and out-groups: The role of gender and moral identity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(2), 199-214.

Women's Funding Network (WFN). (2013). *Champion of women-led change: Connecting leaders, lifting voices*. WFN Annual Report 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.womensfundingnetwork.org/annualreport2013/>.

Women's Funding Network (WFN). (2014). *History*. Retrieved from <http://www.womensfundingnetwork.org/about/history/>.



Women's Philanthropy Institute (WPI). (2013). Women give 2013: New research on charitable giving by girls and boys. Indianapolis: Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. Retrieved from [https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/research/women\\_give\\_2013-final9-12-2013.pdf](https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/research/women_give_2013-final9-12-2013.pdf).

Women's Philanthropy Institute (WPI). (2014). Women give 2014: New research on women, religion, and giving. Indianapolis: Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. Retrieved from [https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/research/womengive14\\_final.pdf](https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/research/womengive14_final.pdf).

Wunnava, P. V., & Lauze, M. A. (2001). Alumni giving at a small liberal arts college: evidence from consistent and occasional donors. *Economics of Education Review*, 20(6), 533-543.

Wuthnow, R. (1995). *Learning to care*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wymer, W. (2011). The implications of sex differences on volunteer preferences. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 22(4), 831-851.

Wymer, Jr, W. W., & Samu, S. (2002). Volunteer service as symbolic consumption: Gender and occupational differences in volunteering. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 18(9-10), 971-989.

Yen, S. T. (2002). An econometric analysis of household donations in the USA. *Applied Economics Letters*, 9, 533-543.

Yörük, B.K. (2010). Charitable giving by married couples revisited. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 45(2), 497-516.

## **Appendix A: Overview on Data and Methods in Philanthropic Research**

This extended overview of data and methods in research on philanthropy is provided as a guide for those who may not be familiar with the terminology and types of studies discussed in this literature review.

The most comprehensive U.S. household survey data on charitable giving come from the Philanthropy Panel Study (PPS), conducted in partnership with the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research's Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), which has surveyed the same households since 1968 and now exceeds 9,000 households. The Lilly Family School of Philanthropy designed and sponsored a philanthropy component beginning in 2001, and the PPS has been conducted every two years since 2001, resulting in six waves of data. Since the PPS is conducted regularly and in partnership with such a wide-ranging longitudinal survey, it is seen as a high-quality data source in philanthropy (Wilhelm, 2006).

A wide range of other survey data have been used to look at questions about giving and volunteering, especially by gender. Data for the Bank of America/U.S. Trust Studies of High Net Worth Philanthropy, conducted by the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, have been collected every two years since 2006. These studies provide a random selection of high net worth households with comparative data for average-income households; however, the survey represents a relatively small sample and is not a longitudinal panel. The Bank of America studies define high net worth households as having a net worth of \$1 million or more (excluding the value of their primary residence) and/or an annual household income of \$200,000 or more (COP, 2011b). Together, the PPS and the Studies of High Net Worth Philanthropy provide the fullest possible picture of giving in the United States. Where the PPS survey oversamples low-income households, the High Net Worth Studies provide an over-representation of the most wealthy households that contribute the majority of charitable dollars.

Independent Sector conducted a survey of Giving and Volunteering in the United States, a national survey of more than 4,000 households, approximately every two years from 1988 through 2001, but has since discontinued its use. Other surveys that have been conducted on a one-time basis or over a brief period of time include the Midlife in the U.S. Survey by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Institute on Aging and the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey by the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. The Survey of Consumer Finances, conducted triennially by the U.S. Federal Reserve Board and the Department of the Treasury, is a promising potential data source for questions about charitable giving in the future. Other surveys omit questions about charitable giving, but are useful for their data on volunteering. The Current Population Survey, a joint effort by the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, primarily collects data on labor force statistics but occasionally includes questions on volunteering and related topics. At the global level, the World Values Survey is conducted in nearly 100 countries and also includes questions on volunteering; the World Values Survey has been conducted in five waves since 1981.

There are several limitations to existing research which center around challenges in data collection, sampling, and measuring giving. First, not all surveys provide representative samples of a national population, making generalizations difficult. Second, convenience samples are neither random nor nationally representative, and typically have a small sample size. Third, measures of giving, income, and wealth may be defined differently depending on the survey

used. This is particularly true for surveys of high net worth giving (Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University [COP], 2011a). It is also difficult to measure non-cash forms of giving, including stock, property, and in-kind gifts. Finally, donors may have difficulty reporting accurate information due to recall bias of the amount of their gift as well as to where it was made. Survey methods that ask specific questions about amounts given, methods of giving and recipient organizations tend to result in fewer instances of missing data, and thus fewer instances of underreporting (Wilhelm, 2007).

As survey data largely rely on self-reported behavior, economists and psychologists tend to favor experimental designs that allow researchers to observe participant decisions as a means of testing existing theory. Experiments are divided into two broad approaches: lab experiments, which take place in a controlled environment; and field experiments, which are conducted in the real world, often using nonprofit organizations as natural settings to reach a sample of donors or volunteers. Examples of lab experiments include ultimatum games, which look at the strategy of inter-personal interactions such as threats and payback; trust games; public goods games, which deal with cooperation; and dictator games, which come closest to approximating charitable giving. Experiments, apart from dictator games, may not provide insight on charitable giving, but may shed light on various motivations or behaviors that lead to giving. Dictator games generally involve one party (the “dictator”) splitting an amount of money between himself or herself and another party (the “recipient”), which is thought to mirror the decision-making process in which a donor must decide how much of his or her money to keep and how much to give away (Creswell, 2013). Experiments often take place at universities, where recruitment of subjects may be easier, but rely on small groups. Typically, subjects make payoff decisions on paper, turning their decisions in to experimenters in sealed envelopes and receiving a payout at the end of the session.

One key example of an experiment on gender and generosity is Andreoni and Vesterlund’s (2001) modified dictator game experiment. The game involved one party (the “dictator”) allocating money between himself or herself and another party (the “recipient”); the modification from the typical dictator game was that there were repeated games (eight, one after the other) with relative prices of payoffs. The researchers then measured how much the dictator allocated to himself or herself versus the recipient; they use this as a lab approximation of generosity. Another example of a lab experiment is Eckel, Grossman, and Johnston’s (2005) dictator game, in which subjects played just one dictator game, with the recipient being a selected charity. This experiment was a more traditional dictator game, where the dictators chose a certain portion of their allocated funds to go to the charity.

Field experiments are carried out in an everyday environment, ranging from helping a stranger on the street to responding to a request for a donation. For example, some field research on charitable giving involves sending out different fundraising appeals to a nonprofit’s mailing list and determining whether one type of appeal is more effective at bringing in donations. While field experiments may be more challenging to structure and often rely on the participation of nonprofit organizations, their findings may often be more generalizable because they take place outside of a laboratory setting.

In one example of research using field experiments, Meier (2007) used two experiments to examine gender and prosocial behavior. Meier took advantage of a system at the University of Zurich, where all students have the opportunity to contribute to two official social funds, and

are informed of this in an official letter about renewing their school registration. In the first experiment, students were provided with additional information about matching donations, in an effort to determine whether providing a gift match would influence donations. In the second experiment, students were provided with additional information about other students' behavior, to study whether donations would be influenced by students comparing themselves to the norm.

Finally, institutional data also have been used to explore questions about giving. This data include information from nonprofits as well as financial management and payment services such as Blackbaud and other corporate entities. For example, large nonprofit institutions, especially colleges and universities, have significant donor databases with information that can be analyzed to examine relationships between donor demographics and giving patterns. Electronic data are growing, but research is limited by the types of information organizations regularly collect and maintain and may only represent a particular segment of a donor population.

There are many scholarly articles about organizations with institutional data, such as Kiva and Blackbaud, but very few of these studies actually use the original institutional data. Kiva, a direct micro-lending site, has been the subject of a handful of research studies, and has provided its internal database for this research. For example, Heller and Badding (2012) use the Kiva data set to explore aspects of microloans that increase the likelihood of funding. Another study that looks at characteristics of donors and recipients uses data from both Kiva and Amnesty International (Masthoff, Langrial, & van Deemter, 2013). In short, there are some scholarly articles using this administrative or institutional data (primarily from Kiva), but none of these studies have explored giving and gender. Some non-academic work has ventured into this topic area; for example, a blog from DonorsChoose has written about how and why male teachers receive more funding than female teachers (Laughlin, 2014). These data sources could provide a wealth of information about how women give as compared to men. Primary obstacles to using this data involve the difficulties of partnering with large, often for-profit organizations, as well as data quality.

While a number of data sources and methods have informed the wider field of philanthropy, these approaches each serve different needs. Some, like lab experiments, may be effective at controlling the environment so that specific theories can be tested; however, these experiments may be more difficult to generalize than field experiments or data from large, nationally representative surveys. Institutional data can be helpful as well, but may not present a representative sample; for example, analyzing a database of donors to a nonprofit may yield findings about those donors, but it does not provide comparison to a group that has not donated to the organization. Each method can be useful in answering different questions and in filling in gaps in the research.